

THE
SATURDAY REVIEW
OF
POLITICS, LITERATURE, SCIENCE, AND ART.

No. 1,409, Vol. 54.

October 28, 1882.

[Registered for
Transmission abroad.]

Price 6d.

EGYPT.

THE Government had only one possible answer to give when Parliament reassembled to inquiries as to its future policy in Egypt. It could not say anything, and could hold out no hope that its silence would be soon broken, as foreign Powers must inevitably be in some measure consulted; and Parliament is always ready to recognize that the tenor of communications with foreign Powers cannot be revealed while these communications are still going on. But the difficulties which the Government may have to encounter with foreign Powers, although not to be treated lightly, are really the least of the difficulties which present themselves when the task of framing England's future Egyptian policy is taken seriously in hand. The greatest, the primary, difficulty is the difficulty of the thing itself, the difficulty of dealing with the materials with which England has to work. A well-guided native Government in Egypt is so easy to talk of vaguely, and so very hard to shape in its practical details. Second, but only second, of the difficulties besetting the Government is the ardour with which a large part of the British public is pushing the Government along the slope of annexation. What makes this particular difficulty greater is that this ardour for annexation is displayed most strongly by the trusted supporters of the Ministry. Liberal journals denounce annexation as monstrous, and at the same time do their best to make it inevitable, by showing triumphantly that everything but annexation must fail. The proposals of BAKER PASHA for the re-organization of the Egyptian army illustrate in almost a painfully conclusive way how hard it is to set up an ideal native Government. The obstacle to giving the KHEDIVE an army really his own is that he has no non-commissioned officers, and few commissioned officers, whom he can trust. BAKER PASHA sets himself to supply the KHEDIVE's needs, and he has apparently been charged with the delicate task of making suggestions because he himself presents something of the combination which it is thought the new Egyptian army must offer. He is a well-known English officer, and yet has served the SULTAN; while he suddenly quitted the service of the SULTAN without waiting for the permission of his new master. He thus is thoroughly English, has a certain flavour of Mahomedanism about him, and yet grants himself complete independence of Turkey when he thinks right. As he is, so is to be the army of his imagining. The new superior officers whom he offers to the KHEDIVE are to be English; but his importations are not to be wholly English, for that would be too like annexation. There must be a Mahomedan flavour about his conception as about himself. He therefore introduces from without a whole body of Mahomedan non-commissioned officers. But they must be as independent of the SULTAN as possible, and must, like their inventor, get out of the SULTAN's dominions as best they can. They are to be exclusively selected from those of the SULTAN's Mahomedan subjects who are notoriously most hostile to him. They are to be Albanians, Bulgarians, and Bosnians, and when they and their English superiors arrive, the native Government of Egypt will be supported by an army which, if not a native army, will be the nearest approach to a native army which BAKER PASHA can devise.

Nothing can be more obvious than the criticism to which this scheme is open. It proposes a native army which is not a native army. To the Egyptians it must

seem a foreign machine which the KHEDIVE is to work so as to keep in order the Egyptians whom he cannot trust. The scheme has, however, the merit of proposing something, and its severest critics see that, if it is to be rejected, it must be rejected on the ground that there is a better scheme that could be adopted. A leading Ministerial journal is quite ready with an alternative. It pronounces that Egypt does not want any Egyptian army at all. The difficulty of creating a loyal native army is boldly solved by having no native army, loyal or disloyal. The Egyptians have, it is said, got the exact army they want, and may keep it. Only let English troops stay on for ever, and everything will be beautifully arranged. This may be quite true, but the proposal is one of scarcely disguised annexation. The only way in which annexation is supposed to be tempered is that the patent and permanent supremacy of England is to be accompanied by giving permission to the Egyptians to go through a harmless Parliamentary farce. And everything that is going on in Egypt is treated in the same way. Forcing English counsel on the Egyptian Government in ARABI's trial was a distinct step on the road to annexation. It gave a serious blow to the dignity and credit of the native Government which is to be honoured and fostered so as to make annexation unnecessary. But the mere allotment of counsel to ARABI is nothing to the strange view of the trial itself which is now becoming popular. It has come to be regarded as a contest between ARABI and England against the SULTAN and the KHEDIVE. ARABI himself is said to be converted, and to see that it is no use trusting the SULTAN or his own people, and that the English are the only real friends and guardians of Egypt. The delightful news is telegraphed that secret correspondence has been deposited by ARABI's counsel in the English Consulate which will most seriously compromise the most eminent persons at Cairo and at Constantinople. Everything that the Egyptian Government does is either the height of folly or the height of wickedness in the eyes of its stern critics. Prisoners are said to be tortured, innocent men threatened and arrested, the prisons kept in a state of disgusting filth—and all is the fault of the Egyptian Government. No doubt the promised disclosures may be highly interesting, and no doubt Egyptian officials go on very much as officials go on in any ordinary Mahomedan country. But all this stern Western criticism is cutting the ground from under the good native Government which was to make annexation unnecessary. When once it is assumed that England is bound to give Egypt a good government, and that facts prove no other good government than that of England to be possible, annexation begins to be within a very measurable distance.

The vote of thanks to the Army and Navy was proposed and seconded in both Houses with the public spirit and good feeling which the leaders of English parties seldom fail to display on the happy occasions when they are called on to act together. Mr. GLADSTONE's eloquence displayed itself in a characteristic way when he was stirred by the unique opportunity of describing how a war, which fortunately happened to be of his own making, had been prepared, conducted, and terminated. The praises lavished on the commanders and the forces were felt to be sincere, because they were felt to have been honestly earned. Every one connected with either service did his duty, not only persistently, but with intelligence and devotion, and

criticism cannot diminish the brilliancy of the operations by which Tel-el-Kebir was won and Cairo was saved. For once, as Mr. GOSCHEN said at Ripon, the mouths of croakers are shut, and even the most obtuse portion of the British public can appreciate the inconsistency of those who, before the expedition began, said it must last for months, and would end in disaster, and then, when it was ended in a fortnight after active operations began, said that any one could have put an end within that ample period to the opposition of poor creatures like the Egyptians. One phrase only in the motion as prepared by the Government gave rise to serious criticism. What the army and navy were thanked for was said to be the suppression of a military rebellion against the KHEDIVE, and obviously the phrase was open to objections, which Mr. GLADSTONE could only meet by saying that it really did not mean anything. There can be no doubt that there was a military rebellion against the KHEDIVE, and that the English forces suppressed it; but to speak only of this military rebellion was to throw into the shade, if not to ignore, the main objects which England had in view in sending its ships to Alexandria and its army to Tel-el-Kebir. We did not put down the movement, whether it was a movement simply military or also popular and religious, merely because it was a movement against a ruler whom we favoured, but much more because it placed in jeopardy the interests of England as mistress of India. At the same time there was one justification of the phrase which cannot, in fairness, be passed over. Lord SALISBURY described, with painful accuracy, the present position of the KHEDIVE now that he is left alone with the English in Egypt, and has neither an army nor a people nor religious feeling to support him, and asked whether it was the firm intention of the Government to support him in this distressing state of things. Lord GRANVILLE replied briefly, but distinctly, that the KHEDIVE would have the unreserved support of England; and it may perhaps be said that one way of pledging itself to give this support was for the Government, in describing the objects of its intervention, to call special attention to the one object of upholding the KHEDIVE's authority.

THE DEBATES ON PROCEDURE.

THE Government carried with unexpected ease and despatch its proposal for confining the attention of the House to the one subject of the New Rules. Mr. GLADSTONE announced that he would introduce some modifications into his Rules, and offered to give a day's delay before entering on the discussion of the Rules in detail, in order that members might first see in print what were the modifications he had proposed. Sir STAFFORD NORTHCOTE accepted the offer, and recommended that no further opposition to the initiatory proposal of the Government should be made. He perhaps disappointed some of the more ardent of his supporters, but he acted on a wise estimate of his position. To prevent the House getting to the business for which it had met would have given countenance to the erroneous supposition that the Conservative party favours obstruction, and hates all reform of Procedure, good or bad. By showing at the outset a willingness to proceed at once to the discussion of the reforms proposed by the Government, he placed himself in the best possible position to discuss each part of the Ministerial scheme on its merits. The modifications introduced by Mr. GLADSTONE were not without importance. The object of two of these changes was to strengthen the position of the Government of the day. By placing new obstacles in the way of members who might seek the leave of the House to move an adjournment after a question has been answered, and by extending to other days the Rule which confines to cognate criticism the opposition to going into Committee on financial matters, Mr. GLADSTONE seeks to place more time at the disposal of the Ministry. His most important announcements were, however, those relating to the First Rule. In the first place, he now proposes that the Speaker or Chairman shall, when taking the first step to closing a debate, be guided, not by one, but by two considerations. He has to form an opinion that the House wishes the debate to end, and he has also to form an opinion that the subject of debate has been adequately discussed. If it is once assumed that the occupant of the Chair will be always a perfectly honourable and impartial person, it must be owned that this change in the

Rule offers a satisfactory obstacle to hasty and arbitrary closing of debate. The Speaker or Chairman would have not merely to look at the size of the majority that desired the close of the debate, but also to consult his inner consciousness, and ask himself what sort of a debate has been going on. Has it been a good, full discussion, affording the House all the aid in coming to a decision which the freely-expressed views of men of various opinions and various sources of information may be expected to give it? A very impartial person, for example, might not unreasonably consider that a subject had not been adequately discussed when the silence of three hundred Liberals had been prolonged for hours, and had been only broken by a few casual observations from the PRIME MINISTER and the HOME SECRETARY.

Mr. GLADSTONE further announced that there were some points of the First Resolution as to which the Government reserved its liberty to accept changes, and that where the House differed from the Government, it would be considered as the best guardian of its authority and honour. This was generally understood, and was perhaps intended, to mean that Liberals might vote against a bare majority ending a debate if they pleased. After these preliminaries, the House got to work on the New Rules, and the first subject discussed showed how many curious and important points may be raised quite fairly and naturally when the details of each Rule are considered. The Government proposed that whatever powers were given to the Speaker should also be given to the Chairman of Committees, and this, at first sight, seems very reasonable, for so far as the Rule is calculated to put down obstruction, it is principally in Committee that obstruction is likely to give ground for its application. But the question suggested itself whether the Speaker and the Chairman of Committees stood on the same footing. The Speaker might be accepted as above all parties, but the Chairman of Committees is avowedly chosen because he is a good party man, and he does not carry with him the same presumption of impartiality that the Speaker does. Mr. PLAYFAIR's lips were closed; but Mr. DODSON and Mr. RAIKES protested that in their day they had been admirably impartial, and had consulted the wishes of their opponents as much as those of their friends. But, even if Chairmen of Committees are to be taken on trust, what was to be said of the unknown persons who, when the physical strength of the Chairman is exhausted, are put into his seat one after another? and what further is to be said of the Chairmen of those Grand Committees which the Government seeks to establish? Were they all to be put on a level with the Speaker, or even with such smaller pearls of impartiality as Mr. DODSON and Mr. RAIKES? Then, again, as Mr. WALTER pointed out, the House was asked to put the cart before the horse, and to decide to whom powers should be given before it had decided what these powers were to be. This was quite true; but it may be observed that the argument might be put the other way, and that if the persons who are to exercise the powers are determined beforehand, then the powers to be given them ought to be accommodated to their probable political character. If logic is to prevail, every step taken by the Government ought to be held as tending to upset their contention that a bare majority shall declare the evident sense of the House. How is it possible for a Speaker to say that a subject has been fully discussed when serious members of the Opposition wish to have more said on it? If the House is to be the ultimate judge of what will best promote its honour and authority, how can it ensure their promotion better than by a Rule which will bring in the leaders of both parties to a decision, and put the leaders of the Opposition on their honour not to allow the authority of the House to be paralysed by wanton obstruction? If Chairmen of Committees are not wholly above suspicion of partisanship, what can be better calculated to remove this suspicion than to make it impossible for them to be supposed to be grasping at a petty party triumph?

The House on Thursday decided that the Chairman of Ways and Means should have, like the Speaker, a power of interfering to close a debate; and Mr. GLADSTONE accepted an amendment moved by Mr. RAIKES, that the power should be strictly confined to the Chairman of Ways and Means, and not be extended to casual Chairmen; and he undertook that no new provisions as to the election of and provision for casual Chairmen would be proposed this Session. Lord RANDOLPH CHURCHILL then sug-

gested that the Chairman should only act after consulting the Speaker; but Sir STAFFORD NORTHCOTE at once rejected the suggestion as inconsistent with the decision of the House, that each of these officials should be trusted to exercise the powers given him. Mr. SCLATER-BOOTH then proposed that the initiative of the Chairman should not extend to Supply, and he referred to a famous night of last spring, when the House was suddenly told that it must pass a vote of four millions of money before the sitting closed. Mr. GLADSTONE replied that this was an irregularity which he hoped would never be imitated, and he declared that Supply was the last matter to which the clôture ought in any case to be applied. During the whole of the sitting, as on that of Wednesday, the Liberal party, with a few exceptions, remained absolutely silent; and, as the Irish party were even more absolutely mute, the Conservatives had to do the whole work of debate. The organs of the Ministry characterize the silence of the Liberals as the only weapon they can employ to defeat the avowed obstructive tactics of the Conservatives, and seem much pleased with the refusal of the Irish members to work with the Opposition. Nothing can be wiser than the reticence of Mr. PARNELL and his friends. They not only escape themselves all reproach of obstruction on this occasion, but they have the satisfaction of letting their English critics find out that what the Ministerial majority calls obstruction is any postponement by debate of the conclusions at which the majority wishes to arrive. No epithet could be less appropriate to the tactics of Sir STAFFORD NORTHCOTE than that of obstructive. Not only has he not been obstructive, but he has really on this occasion led his party and prevented it from anything like the semblance of obstruction. He arranged that immediate precedence should be given to the Rules, and he promptly interceded when he thought that a Conservative amendment was nothing but the revival of a settled controversy. Nor has the debating of the Conservatives been without definite practical utility. It has established that, if the same powers are to be confided to the Speaker and the Chairman, those powers ought to be such as both officials can be equally trusted to exercise. It cleared up the views of the Government as to the position of casual Chairmen, which were at the outset very hazy, and even contradictory. Lastly, it has extracted from Mr. GLADSTONE the admission that, in a sphere so peculiarly its own as Supply, the clôture, in any shape, ought scarcely ever, if ever, to be applied.

MR. HERBERT SPENCER ON AMERICA.

MR. HERBERT SPENCER, whose reputation, if not higher, is more popular in America than in England, has published, in the form of a proclamation or epistle general, the conclusions which he has formed in the course of a visit to the United States. The admiration which he expresses for the material civilization of the country, and especially for the wealth and magnificence of the great cities, will be acceptable, though the subject lies perhaps outside his special province as a philosopher. Humbler travellers can appreciate fine buildings and crowded thoroughfares. Proceeding from observation to prophecy, Mr. SPENCER becomes still more complimentary. It appears that "because of the size and heterogeneity of the components of the American nation, it will be a long time in "evolving its ultimate form." The same proposition, expressed in less scientific language, might perhaps occur to the ordinary understanding. It will be some time before a rapidly increasing population, already amounting to fifty millions, comes to an end, or even assumes an organization which can be reasonably regarded as final. The problem of American destiny is, as Mr. SPENCER suggests, further complicated by the mixture of races which results from European immigration. Germans and Norwegians, English and Irish, retain, for varying periods, their respective national characteristics. There are even districts in which Welsh newspapers circulate and Welsh pulpits resound with sonorous sermons. The common schools and the numerical preponderance of native Americans have hitherto gradually subdued foreign elements into a uniform type; but, with the proportionate increase of new-comers, diversities of character and manners will probably become more frequent. At the same time, alien influences will react on the indigenous majority with effects which will be visible to posterity. Long ago, when a similar

process on a smaller scale was taking place in Italy, Roman patriots deprecated the metaphorical diversion into their own native Tiber of the waters of Orontes; but the Americans well know that their prosperity is promoted by the supply of foreign labour, and they entertain a mixed feeling of complacency and repugnance for some of their swarming guests. Germans, Scandinavians, and English are generally welcome, and the Irish are almost indispensably employed in the rougher kinds of labour. On the other hand, the support which the Irish rabble in the great towns affords to turbulent and corrupt demagogues provokes deep and helpless indignation. The City of New York, which may for some purposes be considered a petty Irish Republic, illustrates, like the drunken Helot of old, the inherent vices of democratic institutions. Politicians in almost all parts of the Union, while they pay a hypocritical deference to the clamour of Irish voters, resent the supposed necessity of tampering with their own convictions. The chief safeguard of American institutions is the division of power among local and national authorities, with the consequent reduction to the smallest limits of the interference of Government. The incessant elections, which might have been expected to create habitual agitation, produce the kind of pleasurable excitement which is stimulated in England by cricket matches and race meetings.

MR. SPENCER, with laudable plainness of speech, calls the attention of the American people to certain dangers of which they are perhaps unconscious. "I have," he says, "been suddenly reminded of the Italian Republics of the middle ages, a whole people gradually losing their freedom amid the growth of great commercial activity, and the development of the arts which rendered them the admiration of Europe. While the American people retain the form of freedom, there has been a considerable loss of the substance. The sovereign people are fast becoming a puppet, which moves and speaks as the wire-pullers determine." By good fortune, and through the operation of certain obscure causes, the wire-pullers in America are, as a rule, rather corrupt than violent. They employ themselves in procuring the election of public functionaries who wish to make their fortunes, and neither to impair the security of property nor to reduce their fellow-citizens to subjection. Mr. SPENCER states that he does not think free institutions a failure; but, as far as they are exemplified in the United States, he evidently does not think that they have succeeded. As he wisely remarks, "America is simply showing on a larger scale than has ever been shown before that paper Constitutions will not work as intended." He adds, with perfect truth, that "the diffusion of education is not a remedy. It is essentially a question of character, not lack of information, but lack of certain moral sentiments." A constitutional and social system which produces a lack of the moral sentiments essential to the maintenance of freedom might, in the judgment of some critics, be deemed to have failed. Liberty has never been enjoyed in modern times by any community of the first rank except two. America has been free since the foundation of the several colonies, and England for several centuries, and more fully since the Revolution of 1688. From the date of the colonial rebellion a nominal increase of American freedom has consisted in exemption from external control. The independent Union of States inherited the English common law, and the tradition of personal freedom and representative government. Philanthropic English enthusiasts still from time to time affect to see in the two countries a single nation; but Americans are less easily pleased. For three-quarters of a century the gradual divergence of political habit and thought furnished the most instructive of historical studies; but in the present generation, and especially since the rise of Mr. GLADSTONE to supreme power, great efforts have been made to assimilate the Government and Legislature of the mother-country to the American type. The Birmingham Caucus is a deliberate and not unsuccessful attempt to naturalize in England the vicious practices which, according to Mr. HERBERT SPENCER, endanger liberty in the United States. The explanation of the possible failure of American institutions itself requires to be explained. It is of course true that paper Constitutions, like other projected rules, will not work as intended. The same statement would be true of self-sown Constitutions such as that of England, if there were any formal design with which their results could be compared. The American Constitution has been maintained with remark-

able fidelity, though its operation has been largely affected by the growth of democratic power, and more especially by the introduction of universal suffrage.

Modern theorists, while they are ready to accept the most far-fetched solutions of political puzzles, seldom trouble themselves to understand the most exceptional peculiarity of hereditary English freedom. As a matter of fact, this country is distinguished from other free communities by the large infusion of aristocratic influence into every social and political department. It might perhaps appear to an absolutely impartial spectator that the predominance in New York and Birmingham of wire-pullers over independent politicians is the natural result of level democracy. He might even proceed to the startling belief that peers are better than wire-pullers. In many parts of England they still enjoy the honorary pre-eminence which in the United States belongs to the managers of political parties. The barbarously named and questionably scientific study of sociology cannot condescend to occupy itself with so actual and so historical a phenomenon as aristocracy. The "easygoing readiness to permit small trespasses" which is attributed by Mr. SPENCER to the Americans undoubtedly tends to the "habit of acquiescence in wrong" and the decay of free institutions." An inquiry into the causes of a negligence which is equivalent to indifference to freedom might be instructive, but it might perhaps lead to heretical doubts as to the sanctity of democratic equality. Privileged persons and classes are seldom inclined to acquiesce in wrong done to themselves, and consequently they become the natural guardians of liberty against usurpation from above or from below.

Mr. HERBERT SPENCER's political scepticism as to the prospects of American freedom will probably be condoned in consideration of his biological optimism. It is impossible to test the soundness of his confident prophecy of the future perfection of the American race. "From biological truths it is to be inferred that the eventual mixture of allied varieties of the Aryan race forming the population will produce a more powerful type of man than has hitherto existed, a type more plastic, more adaptable, more capable of undergoing the modifications needful for complete social life. I think Americans may reasonably look forward to the time when they will have produced a civilization greater than the world has known." That physical and intellectual giants will be bred from a cross between Yankees and Irishmen is a pleasant, but uncertain, speculation. It would be interesting to learn whether, in the new order of the American world, wire-pullers will be squeezed out of existence, if, indeed, their race is not perpetuated on a grander scale. As Mr. SPENCER's anticipations are confined to the Aryan races, there seems to be little prospect of improvement for the African inhabitants of the Southern States. In the coming age of gold, it may be presumed that the cross-bred Aryans of the North will, in their grand civilization, recover the freedom which, according to the same authority, their ancestors are likely to lose. If in this instance also it were permissible to appeal from prophetic biology to history, it might not be irrelevant to remark that the highest type of American civilization yet known was furnished by the leaders of the original rebellion who founded the United States. From that time to the present there has been an uninterrupted progress of political degeneracy, though it may in some instances have been rather apparent than real, inasmuch as merit and personal qualifications have been less and less regarded in the selection of Presidents and official statesmen. Whether a partial infusion of Irish, or even of Norwegian, blood will reverse the process which has continued for a century, can for the present only be known by implicit believers in Mr. HERBERT SPENCER's infallibility.

PROFESSOR PALMER'S EXPEDITION.

THE news which was telegraphed yesterday morning from Suez as to the fate of Professor PALMER's companions has been received with universal grief and horror. There can be no doubt as to the murder of Captain GILL and Lieutenant CHARRINGTON. A loophole is left for hope as to the leader of the expedition. Professor PALMER, we are told, in a tragical sentence, covered his eyes with his hand and leaped over a precipice. His body has not been found. The story is too circumstantial. It has an Oriental air about it. What is certain is that

Professor PALMER has disappeared, and that his unfortunate companions have been brutally murdered by a representative of the Egyptian Government. It is difficult to speak or think calmly in the face of such a certainty, of such an anxiety. But it will be well to have the few known facts plainly stated, so that, when the full truth is revealed, we may judge how the blame of this shocking crime is to be apportioned. We must, in the first place, endeavour, in spite of the mist which red tape and officialism would raise before our eyes, to understand what was the nature of the employment in which these three courageous Englishmen have risked, and two of them at least have lost, their lives. That they went to buy camels and cut telegraph wires is a mere blind, and has been virtually abandoned even by officially inspired papers. Professor PALMER, attended only by a Greek servant, started from Gaza in July, and after a journey of seventeen days by way of Hebron and the desert, through the central region of the peninsula of Sinai, reached Suez during the first week in August. The object of this perilous enterprise is an open secret. Had the Bedouins of the peninsula been hostile, backed up as they are by the whole of Arabia, Sir GARNET WOLSELEY's flank movement on the Canal would have been almost, if not quite, impossible. Professor PALMER, with his life literally in his hands, sought out, one by one, the Sheykh whom he had known in former visits to the same region. His object in thus, as it were, putting his head into the mouth, not of one but of many lions, has not been revealed, but we know that Sir GARNET WOLSELEY was not attacked in rear. The second expedition, the first having been so eminently successful, left Suez on the 10th of August, and consisted of four, if not five, Europeans—namely, Professor PALMER, Captain GILL, Lieutenant CHARRINGTON, an English servant, and a dragoman. In a few days or a few hours—the accounts are here contradictory—one of the commonest of the accidents of Eastern travel took place; they got separated from their baggage. When this happens, as a rule one party waits for the other; but it is possible that Professor PALMER, anxious to keep an appointment he had made with the Sheykh of the principal Arab tribes of the peninsula, left his companions to wait for the luggage camels, and rode on himself with one guide and the money he had promised the Sheykh. There can be no object in anticipating the further details of the story, which may come to us in a few hours. But the British public will expect to be enlightened on certain points. Who is the Governor of Nakhl? He, with two other Governors, those of El Arish and of Akabah, has been frequently mentioned, and the latest news would bring home the guilt of the actual murder to the first named.

An outlying station on Egyptian territory, such as Nakhl, a mere oasis in a sea of desert, would be defended by a handful of soldiers and an officer, all probably banished to such a remote spot for misconduct. A convict at Botany Bay would hold and deserve a higher social position than the average governor of an Egyptian desert fort, who would in all probability be a Turkish adventurer, one of the scores of such people who annually come from Constantinople into Egypt, and for whom the KHEDIVE is expected to find employment. Every one who knows Egypt has met them. The better behaved become station-masters in the villages of the Said, or Sheykh in Nubia; the others are appointed agents of civilization among the Bedouins, and become "governors" of such places as Nakhl. Their character and antecedents must be perfectly well known at Cairo, yet no account of them comes home. Now and then it falls to the lot of one of these men to have the chance of distinguishing himself by some piece of unusual barbarity. It is but too likely that Professor PALMER, in making his rendezvous with the Sheykh or Emir of the Teyaha tribe at Nakhl, ran a greater risk than if he had encountered the wildest horde of Arabs between Suez and the Hedjaz.

The most serious question remains. Why was there so great a delay in sending to seek for the missing party? True, war on a great scale was being waged along the western bank of the Canal; but there must have been many naval officers and others unemployed at Suez between the 12th of August, when the first news was brought to Suez, and the time, nearly three weeks, when Colonel WARREN, so promptly despatched by the Admiralty, could reach that place from England. His earliest care was to search round the coast, where, at Akabah, he

received the first rumour of the present disastrous news. But the naval authorities seem to have contented themselves when they heard that an Arab from the missing caravan was at Moses's Well, a few miles off, by asking the Governor of Suez to send two soldiers to fetch him. The soldiers, of course, warned him of his danger, and a delay of several weeks ensued through the absence of any direct evidence as to the history of the unfortunate travellers after their first start. Nakhl is only four days' journey from Suez. Everything pointed to Nakhl as the place for which the party would make in case of an accident. Yet no communication appears to have been attempted with Nakhl until Colonel WARREN went out. A certain amount of mystery will always, we must fear, hang over the last chapter of this tragical story; but, assuredly, the apathy and procrastination of the English authorities at Suez must be explained, or at least accounted for. Meanwhile, the friends of Professor PALMER, remembering the perils of his former expeditions—his especial peril in the last and most successful journey from Gaza to Suez, his personal popularity with the Bedouins, his unfailing resource in danger, and all the other qualities which fitted him so pre-eminently for the task imposed upon him by his country—will continue to nourish the small spark of hope yet left alight by yesterday's telegrams.

LORD RANDOLPH CHURCHILL'S CASE.

THERE are two mistakes which are equally likely to be committed, and which, as a matter of fact, have been committed, in reference to the constitutional discussion which opened the Autumn Session. It is possible to take it too seriously, but it is also possible (and curiously enough this fault seems to have been committed by enemies as well as friends of the new Rules) to take it not nearly seriously enough. There was a time when English adoration for precedents, and English neglect of first principles in dealing with political and especially with constitutional matters, was the subject of a good deal of ridicule both at home and abroad. It seems that all this has been changed, to judge by the remarkable equanimity with which a proceeding involving, as can be very easily shown against Mr. GLADSTONE and Sir WILLIAM HARROD, an entire violation of precedent and a direct contravention of the dicta of the most respectable authorities, has been regarded. On the other hand, it may be acknowledged freely that under present circumstances the technical objection loses much of its importance. So peculiar is the temper of the present majority, that though there might have been a little more trouble in enforcing Mr. GLADSTONE's decisions (whatever they may turn out finally to be) by the constitutional machinery of a prorogation and a fresh beginning, instead of by the unconstitutional proceeding of an adjournment, and a kind of *coda* tacked on irregularly after the Session had been concluded by the relinquishment of the power of the purse, they would have been equally certain of enforcement in the end. A new Session would neither have inspirited nor discouraged the hundred wavering Liberals who are known to be balancing between their consciences and the Caucus. It would not have intensified or lessened the indifference with which one set of electors regard the proposals, or the dislike with which they are regarded by another set. It would not have warmed or cooled the fervent devotion of the local party managers, or of the local newspapers, which, as a rule, represent those managers, and those managers only. Hence the objection is rather one of theory than of practice, rather directed against what threatens to be a general and growing error of principle, than fitted to upset a particular application of that principle. In this sense, and in this sense only, it may be regarded as to a certain extent academic. But in itself it was fully worth urging, and the manner in which it was met showed abundantly that it was directed against a real danger.

A careful examination of the speeches on either side will show beyond doubt that, as far as precedent and authority are concerned, Lord RANDOLPH CHURCHILL's position is unassailable. It is so unassailable that, except by reference to the supposed exception of 1820 and by a chicane about the inadequacy of a motion for adjournment to remedy the alleged fault, neither the PRIME MINISTER nor the HOME SECRETARY attempted to meet it on this ground. Mr. GLADSTONE's jocularity need not be dwelt upon, though

it is generally acknowledged by friends as well as foes, that if there is one personage who shows to less advantage than Mr. GLADSTONE explanatory it is Mr. GLADSTONE jocular. But, putting this aside, Queen CAROLINE's case is the sole incident in all Parliamentary history on which the Government champions attempted to rely, while against the weighty opinions brought forward by Lord RANDOLPH CHURCHILL they produced nothing whatever. Now there is something in Mr. Gorst's argument that, while the Ministers of 1820 kept the House of Commons in a kind of succession of trances waiting for the coming down of the Bill of Pains and Penalties from the Lords, they brought no business of any sort before it. But, independently of this, it ought to be remembered that that Bill presented no sort of analogy to the present business. Sir WILLIAM HARROD affected to regard the Bill of Pains and Penalties as "the most 'tremendous business which a Government ever brought 'under consideration.'" This must be admitted to be an admirable example of courageous, or perhaps humorous, hyperbole. But, as a matter of fact, this tremendous business, grave as it was from its indirect bearing on the reputation and popularity of the Sovereign, can hardly be said to have been, except technically, public business at all. Had the parties been simply GEORGE and CAROLINE GUELPH, the business would have been a mere private Act, affecting no public interest whatever. Again, even if the formal precedent be allowed, the principle of Lord RANDOLPH CHURCHILL's objection is not touched. The doctrine of "Grievance before Supply," and the principle that, until all public business requiring to be transacted has been transacted the command of the purse shall not be given up, was in no way violated. Instead of subjects approaching a King who might be encouraged to turn a deaf ear to them by their previous complaisance, the KING was actually approaching his subjects, cap in hand, demanding release and relief. They were masters of the situation; they occupied for the time not the traditional position of Parliament at all, but simply that of a court of law, which happened to be the only one empowered to give or refuse redress for a certain alleged grievance. That it might have been better, even in that case, to adhere to the salutary, and in every other case unbroken, rule of making the passing of the Appropriation Act carry with it prorogation may be argued. But the character of the business then engaged in was emphatically such that the whole objection of principle fell to the ground.

The attempt to pooh-pooh that objection of principle (an attempt which has been strangely made by some of the very persons who are most violently opposed to the *clôture*) will hardly be repeated by any one who has the slightest appreciation of constitutional history or of constitutional doctrine. The words constitution and constitutional have been infinitely abused, and, no doubt, their general meaning is not too definite. But, if any short description can be given of a constitution, it is perhaps that it is a more or less elaborate system of checks. The constitutional theory recognizes the fact that in matters political precipitate action, no matter by whom it is taken, is far more dangerous than inaction, and it accordingly provides rules and principles which render action necessarily deliberate and slow. In an absolute democracy like Appenzell or Athens, in an absolute monarchy like Turkey or Russia, a single vote or a single stroke of the pen can, theoretically at least, do or undo anything. For this liberty of action the modern Radical pants. He has persuaded himself, or has been persuaded, that great numbers of important measures—the importance of which is invisible to the rest of the community—are urgently necessary, and he chafes at every restriction and check in beginning them. He must still be doing, and the spirit of the Constitution of England is that in political matters doing shall be surrounded with all sorts of difficulties. Both directly and indirectly Mr. GLADSTONE and those of whom Mr. GLADSTONE is partly the leader and partly the tool strive to do away with this state of things. They grumble at the House of Lords, less because the House of Lords ever does anything that is obnoxious to them than because it sometimes checks them in doing what they like. They cry for *clôture*; they rejoice in urgency; they favour little *coups d'état* on the part of the officials of the House; they crave for longer Sessions, earlier meetings, and so forth. Anything that abridges the process of legislation, that makes it easier to

crowd the Statute-book with enactments worrying or crotchetty, destructive or doctrinaire, makes them happy. It is perfectly conceivable that in such a mood, the theoretical danger of the Crown misusing Supply being obsolete, and the very practical danger of a Minister misusing it not presenting itself at the moment to their imaginations, they should think little of Lord RANDOLPH CHURCHILL's reminder, and set it down as a mere party move. It may even be granted that, from their point of view, they are perfectly justified in doing so. Constitutional precedents of this kind are only in the way of those who, like Captain MARRYAT's boatswain, are "always in a 'state of 'mergency," and who believe the *raison d'être* of Parliament to be to prevent the thirsty from quenching their thirst in Cornwall, or to forbid a father to guard against the follies of youth by settling his estate. But there must be at least some Englishmen left to whom feverish activity does not seem to be the ideal condition of a legislator, who can recognize the advantages of hampering rash or destructive experiment, and who will perceive the objection urged on Tuesday to be not merely pertinent from the point of view of precedent, but valuable from the point of view of principle.

MR. GLADSTONE AND LIBERTY.

IN a speech delivered last week at Sheffield, Mr. MUNDELLA attacked Sir STAFFORD NORTHCOTE for his recent declaration that the Conservatives ought to inscribe the word "freedom" on their banner. It is not necessary to confine every clause of a political oration within the limits which are applied, or which ought to be applied, to an affidavit. Sir STAFFORD NORTHCOTE probably values law and order as well as liberty; and he must be perfectly aware that the mission of Conservatism is rather to restrain than to encourage license. He was perfectly justified in the implied assertion that the Radicals of the present day are disposed to widen the province of legislation, and to disregard the old Liberal maxim that every man is the best judge of his own interest. It was not necessary in a rhetorical phrase to exhaust the catalogue of Conservative doctrines. Mr. MUNDELLA, who is an able and honest man, though from time to time he assumes the character of a violent partisan, is certainly not exempt from the defect of one-sided statement which he attributes to Sir STAFFORD NORTHCOTE, and in one part of his speech he thought fit to assert that Irish anarchy was yielding "to the remedial, not to 'the coercive, measures of Government.'" In other words, he wishes to dissociate himself from that part of the Ministerial policy which may be unpopular, while he takes credit for the concessions made to malcontent tenants at the expense of the landlords. It would be useless to discuss for the hundredth time the policy of the Land Act; but it is certain that the transfer of property from one class to another interferes more directly with the principle of freedom than an alteration in criminal procedure which has rendered it possible for a few murderers to be convicted and hanged.

The symptoms of a growing indifference to liberty deserve vigilant attention. Amongst other indications of political degeneracy the growth of personal adulation requires special notice. Language which would once have been thought ridiculous and offensive is now habitually used with reference to the chief dispenser of patronage and power. Similar outbursts of extravagant eulogy became common when the Roman Republic was declining into the Empire. The French Senate was not louder in its praises of NAPOLEON than the followers and subordinate colleagues of Mr. GLADSTONE in admiration of their chief. No adversary disputes the great qualities of the PRIME MINISTER; but it is doubtful whether he is not disposed both to encroach on the privileges of Parliament and to encourage legislative usurpation. Mr. MUNDELLA is of course sincere in his enthusiasm for Mr. GLADSTONE's person and character; but passionate devotion to a leader ought to be expressed with a certain reticence and moderation. It seems that Mr. MUNDELLA has always believed Mr. GLADSTONE to be the greatest living statesman; but since he has been officially connected with him "he has been led to believe 'him to be the greatest member of Parliament that ever lived. He was the purest, the most conscientious, and 'the most high-minded statesman, and England was fortunate in having at her head a statesman who, &c. &c., 'and who was still bent, single-minded and single-hearted,

" upon giving his great genius, his noble energy, his wonderful combination of intellect and physique to the service of his country." The senator in JUVENAL who celebrated the praises of DOMITIAN was scarcely more eloquent than Mr. MUNDELLA. Mr. ARNOLD, who lately dilated at Salford on the same engrossing theme, must acknowledge himself to be defeated in the courtly competition. There is no doubt that Mr. GLADSTONE is bent on giving his genius to the service of his country. His enemies say the same thing in other words when they calumniate him as eager to seize supreme power, and pertinacious in retaining it.

Sir STAFFORD NORTHCOTE seems to have expanded his protest against encroachments on freedom into a denunciation of "the caucus, the clôture, and interference with 'contracts.'" There can be no difference of opinion as to the tendency of the clôture to restrict the freedom of Parliamentary debate. The innovation, even if it were necessary, and therefore justifiable, is avowedly designed to deprive the Opposition of certain rights which have been exercised from time immemorial. Some Liberal members, including Mr. STANSFIELD, have recently declared their disapproval of the Ministerial project, and more especially of the servile apology which is founded on Mr. GLADSTONE's supposed incapacity of abusing power with which he may be entrusted. Triumphant demagogues have in all ages been assured by their flatterers that, like kings, they could do no wrong. It seems scarcely necessary to argue that partial prohibition of freedom of contract is an interference with freedom. In this case also it is conceivable that there might be sufficient reasons for restriction; but bolts and bars, even when they are required, have no tendency to promote liberty of transit. The dangers to freedom from the institution of the caucus are at the same time less direct and more comprehensive. Sir STAFFORD NORTHCOTE was not bound by the statement of a Conservative wirepuller that he entertained a natural predilection for the machinery with which he was personally concerned. The Birmingham Caucus resembles, as has been frequently shown, the Clubs which controlled the French Legislature during the First Revolution. At present Mr. GLADSTONE, with the aid of one of his colleagues, from time to time coerces the House of Commons by threatening mutinous Liberal members with the resentment of the federated Associations. It is notorious that he could not have hoped to carry the first Procedure Resolution by an appeal to the judgment of the House. By connecting himself with the Birmingham wire-pullers he, not for the first time, impairs the security of constitutional government. The most devoted adherents of Mr. GLADSTONE in the press are more outspoken, and perhaps more extreme, in their aspirations than their idolized leader. The House of Commons has more than once been warned that, if it fails to carry Liberal measures, it must be superseded by some more compliant authority.

Sir STAFFORD NORTHCOTE may perhaps have profanely intended to include Mr. GLADSTONE in his accusations against the party. If impeccable statesmen were liable to criticism, the Opposition might, not without plausibility, contend that Liberal assaults on freedom have not been discouraged by the head of the party. Within a year or two Mr. GLADSTONE has for the first time supported Sir WILFRID LAWSON in his agitation for compulsory suppression of the trade in alcoholic liquors. Local option was in itself a sufficiently tyrannical process; but the United Kingdom Alliance, since it secured the adhesion of the infallible PRIME MINISTER, has become more ambitious or more candid. Sir WILFRID LAWSON lately announced his design of abolishing the trade, professing at the same time, with instructive simplicity, his inability to understand how any person who himself abstained from the use of beer could hesitate to compel the rest of the community to follow his example. As far as he countenances the temperance agitation, Mr. GLADSTONE is an enemy of freedom. His Irish legislation has been excused by himself and his apologists as an exceptional remedy for extraordinary evils. It was not difficult to foresee the repudiation of his promises that no similar attempt at arbitrary legislation should be made in other parts of the United Kingdom. In his answers to deputations from English and Scotch tenant-farmers who openly avow their predatory intentions, Mr. GLADSTONE has, if his language has any meaning, adhered to the doctrine of spoliation. He promised to tenants security of any tenure which they may possess, for the apparent purpose of

admitting their claim to a new tenant-right. He cannot have been ignorant that every occupier enjoys an unassailable tenure, whether his term, or the residue of his term, extends to a week or twenty years. Prohibition of voluntary agreements for the hire of land is assuredly a violation of freedom. In one instance alone Mr. GLADSTONE has shown a distaste for compulsory legislation. The claim of a small minority of the population to propagate without hindrance the contagion of a virulent disease approved itself by some strange caprice to Mr. GLADSTONE's judgment. He consequently held out hopes to the fanatics who reject the duty of vaccinating their children that in this instance he would for once oppose compulsory legislation. It is a question of secondary importance whether the Conservative leaders are champions of freedom. Old-fashioned Liberals disapprove both of the habitual interference of Parliament with private discretion and of appeals to the multitude from Parliament. No observant politician has trusted Mr. GLADSTONE's respect for constitutional doctrines since his abolition of purchase in the army by Royal Warrant when he had failed to carry the measure through Parliament. The employment of an obsolete prerogative belonging to the Crown implies the same political tendency which leads a party leader to ally himself with irresponsible Clubs for the purpose of applying external pressure to the House of Commons.

MORE SOPS FOR IRELAND.

THE Autumn Session has opened gloomily in more ways than one, but perhaps in no way more gloomily than in reference to Ireland. In itself the quiescence of the Irish Opposition on the opening day would not be specially remarkable. The merest tiro in politics has learnt that the surprises of Parliament are at least as numerous as the surprises of cricket or of whist. But the man who is something more than a tiro knows that, like the surprises of cricket and of whist, the surprises of Parliament are generally capable of being accounted for in a manner which makes them cease altogether to be surprising. The almost supernatural calm and silence which have distinguished the Irish party throughout, its scanty muster at divisions, the absence of any attempt on its part to bring forward the usual grievances, are certainly not inexplicable. It is impossible not to recognize and to lament in the action of Mr. GLADSTONE on the subject of Contempt of Court a fresh concession to Irish clamour—a concession of that unfortunate, but far from novel, kind which redresses no real grievance, while it encourages unreasonable and disloyal demands. It may be granted, if anybody pleases, that the power of committing for contempt of court, like all powers which depend on individual discretion, has not invariably been discreetly exercised. But it is in the fact of its discretionary exercise that its value consists as a terror to evildoers, and no restriction of it can be anything but a sop either directly to Irish clamour or to the curious Radical desire that evildoers shall not be terrified. The special occasion is, however, more unfortunate than the general rule of action. It is scarcely rash to say that no man has ever been punished, by whatsoever authority, who more richly deserved his punishment than Mr. GRAY. It is still less rash to say that there is no country in which a rebuff to those who have the courage to brave popular fury in administering law and justice is so much to be deprecated as it is in Ireland. It is easy to retort that Mr. GLADSTONE's action does not of necessity imply any slur upon Mr. Justice LAWSON. The question is not what it necessarily implies, but what in the circumstances it will inevitably be taken to imply. Mr. PLUNKETT's protest on this subject was amply justified, though unfortunately it cannot prevent the evil it deprecates.

The mischief of doing anything which may hearten and inspirit Irish disaffection is the more apparent because that disaffection, though as malevolently active as ever, is for the moment in difficulties. The agitators in Ireland are quarrelling bitterly among themselves; their supporters in America are not only quarrelling bitterly among themselves, but enlarging the ring so as to make the Irish agitators partakers in the squabble. The breach—scarcely susceptible of being securely bridged—between Mr. DAVITT and Mr. PARNELL has been sufficiently exposed; but

this is by no means the only rift in the anti-English party. Mr. P. J. SMYTH—who (*vox clamans in deserto* as he generally is) deserves attention, not merely because of his eloquence, but because he represents a party which, however mistaken, is the most respectable and the least corrupt of so-called Irish parties—has just described the Parliamentary followers of his late chief as following “an oriflamme which is nothing but a white feather stuck in Mr. PARNELL's hat,” and this sort of language is sure to be echoed. In America itself a dejected advocate of anarchy laments that, according to recent evidence, “Irish opinion is getting flabby.” It is precisely at this moment, when the house of the enemy is divided against itself, and when the rank and file are thinking of betaking themselves to farm and merchandize, and letting Home Rulers chatter and Nationalists grumble as they please, that Mr. GLADSTONE comes forward with an encouragement to freshen up the flagging spirit of sedition. Whatever may be his proposals, however moderate and well considered they may be, the Parnellite party can go to what in their case represents the country with the boast that, in consequence of their complaints, the law of England has been, or is to be, altered; that Mr. GLADSTONE has been so afraid of their orderly and legitimate opposition that he has once more capitulated; that there is nothing which the continuance of the policy of the last few years will not effect. Thus the PRIME MINISTER of England has done his best to take the white feather (to use Mr. SMYTH's words) out of Mr. PARNELL's hat and to replace it with one of a cheerful and triumphant colour. He has once more said “Squeeze me,” once more declared that anything may be had for knocking. And what makes this more discreditable and more mischievous is that it wears, and must necessarily wear to all impartial eyes, the appearance of a renewal of the notorious bargaining of last spring.

Nor are the evidences of a desire to propitiate the Irish party limited to this ill-advised proposal. Mr. HERBERT GLADSTONE is, indeed, not in himself an important person. In the first flush of his election for Leeds two years ago, when it was thought expedient to rejoice Gladstonians with the prospect of a successor to their idol, he was permitted to be frequent on platforms. But as he soon showed that he had inherited nothing but a double portion of his father's belief in himself and of his faculty of non-natural explanation, and that the want of good taste which with Mr. GLADSTONE is but occasional was with him chronic, he was discreetly silenced. It is evident, however, that his utterances, in themselves worthy of no attention, have in the circumstances a certain responsibility attached to them. They may not be inspired; they must be taken as permitted. When, therefore, Mr. HERBERT GLADSTONE assures his constituents at Leeds of his hopes “that before long the Irish people will be able to deal without let or hindrance with Irish questions that do not affect Great Britain,” the words are not merely the words of a talkative and inconsiderate young man. Mr. HERBERT GLADSTONE is not merely Mr. HERBERT GLADSTONE; he is “that unfeathered two-legged thing—a son.” He does, moreover, in these words little more than put the dots on the i's of that mysterious utterance in the early part of last Session by which Mr. GLADSTONE prematurely tried to catch the Irish members. On this occasion more corn has certainly been shaken into the chaff. It is still barely possible to contend that Mr. HERBERT GLADSTONE's words mean nothing but local self-government; but it is obvious that they may mean, and certain that they will be taken to mean, a great deal more. The utterance, too, chimes in remarkably with the expressed opinions of a large section of the Radical party. Not a few members of that party who have not taken the final plunge in favour of Home Rule pure and simple have dropped a tear over Mr. PARNELL's new proposals as being reasonable and excellent in themselves and only inopportune in time. Others, more practically given, are constantly harping on the danger of an increased Irish party irreconcilably hostile to Mr. GLADSTONE, and able, if the Liberal majority be only a little further weakened, to turn the scale in favour of those children of darkness, the Tories. But, what is more, the whole Radical party without exception, or with only the exception of those who have let an Egyptian shadow fall between them and their leader, are feverishly anxious that Mr. GLADSTONE should be up and doing. He is now, they say, very strong; now or never is the time to give Conservatism its quietus. This cannot be

done without the Clôture, and therefore Radicalism is almost unanimous in favour of a measure which at first sight seems revolting to every sentiment of the Radical mind. To secure this power of working their will there is evidently nothing that some Radicals would not do. They would, like SHAKSPEARE's (or PEELE'S) JOAN OF ARC, "lop a member off and give it" to any power that will help them—and what member so convenient as Ireland? There is no reason for supposing that the sentiments which are evidently uppermost with the party are otherwise than uppermost, consciously or not, with their chief. Mr. GLADSTONE, no doubt, is not consciously indifferent to the welfare of the country. But as he is deliberately and primarily convinced that nothing can be so much for the welfare of the country as his own continuance in power, a sense of duty no less than a more natural, if less creditable, feeling impels him to take every measure for securing the immediate end. It is, of course, for English and Scotch electors in the last, to decide whether the price which is evidently in contemplation is or is not too much to pay for the advantage to be secured.

DYNAMITE AND THE FRENCH REPUBLIC.

THE news from France would have seemed more serious a few years back than it does now. In an age of dynamite even dynamite ceases to attract much attention. France is but sharing the misfortunes of her neighbours. The mother of revolutions cannot hope that the Socialist wave will not reach her when Russia and Ireland have not escaped from it. There are circumstances, however, which give the trials that have just been interrupted at Chalon-sur-Saône, together with the explosions and consequent arrests that have taken place elsewhere, an importance of their own. In other countries, however tamely the Government may play its part in maintaining order and vindicating the law, there is no one else that the nation can turn to to render it these elementary but necessary services. The Czar may be weak in Russia, the LORD-LIEUTENANT may be weak in Ireland; but those who seek peace and ensue it can but hope that authority will in time assert itself with greater wisdom or greater decision. In France alone something greater than the holders of office is on its trial. In Russia or Ireland the discredit which unchecked disorder brings upon those whose business it is to check it is scored to the persons by whom the government is administered. In France it extends to the Government itself. The lovers of order in Russia or Ireland are not tempted to overthrow the monarchy or to sever the connexion with England. The lovers of order in France can hardly fail to ask themselves whether, in view of what is going on around them, the Republic, as the word is now understood in France, is after all the form of government that suits them best. Questions of this kind are seldom put openly until the moment has come for answering them. But they may minister to a general distrust without being put openly. It is true that, in the special conditions of French parties, the Republic has an immense advantage in the fact that its enemies are paralysed by their own divisions. If the BOURBONS or the Bonapartists had now a chief who could count on the active support of all his nominal followers, the Republic might be in real danger. So long as the Legitimists distrust the Count of PARIS and the Orleanists know that the Count of CHAMBOURG is impracticable, the Royalist party counts for next to nothing. So long as the adherents of Prince NAPOLEON and Prince VICTOR hate each other as heartily as though they were in hostile camps, the Imperialist party counts for next to nothing. But the confidence which this state of affairs naturally gives the Republicans may easily become delusive. If the Republic were seen to be tottering, it is impossible to say what changes might not be wrought in the attitude and distribution of its adversaries by the dawn of a new hope. In the long run the Government of France rests neither with the Republicans nor with the Monarchs. It rests with that vast and silent multitude which tolerates everything up to a certain point, and nothing when that point has been passed. The Republic may retain their acquiescence long after it has forfeited their confidence, but sooner or later the loss of the one will entail the loss of the other.

M. DUCLERC and his colleagues cannot now be accused of making too little of the recent Socialist disturbances.

On the contrary, they seem inclined to fall into the opposite error of showing themselves too much disturbed by them. While the trials arising out of the outrages at Montceau-les-Mines have been going on at Chalon, arrests have been made in all parts of France. But an arrest which is followed the next day by a release for want of evidence, while it shows that the police are extraordinarily active, shows also that they are extraordinarily ill advised. Either they have been misled by information which as soon it comes to be looked into is seen to be false, or they have lost their heads and conjured up criminals where criminals are not. That the Government believe themselves to be on the track of a really serious conspiracy of some kind is beyond question. The character of the evidence given at the trials goes to show this. So little was to be got out of the witnesses, that the only point that admitted of any doubt was whether their silence was the silence of accomplices or of men who were afraid to speak. The very time while the trials were going on was chosen for explosions at Lyons and for the display of threatening placards in other towns. The Public Prosecutor has now obtained a postponement of the trials, and a change of the venue from Chalon-sur-Saône to Paris, on the ground that the jury have been incapacitated by threatening letters from the proper discharge of their duty. If any blame can fairly be laid on the authorities, it relates to the indifference with which they seem to have received the first news of the conspiracy. As long ago, it seems, as October 1881 an ironmaster near Montceau obtained from one of his workmen the statutes of one secret society; and, on forwarding them to the Prefect, he was told that the existence of several others was known to the departmental authorities, and had been reported to Paris. That no steps were taken to prevent the subsequent outbreak, or to acquaint the public with its real significance when it happened, is one of the many incidents which now minister to public distrust and uneasiness. The peculiar character which the outbreak at Montceau-les-Mines assumed is plainly due to the recent policy of the Republican party. It is naturally the object of a conspiracy directed against property and order in general to obtain as much sympathy as possible for its first overt acts. In all countries to some extent, and in France to a very great extent, permitted violence leads to a great deal more violence. It is probable that the ultimate object of the Montceau rioters was to frighten the Government into bringing forward some plan for the transfer of the mines from the idle masters to the industrious men. That all property which is in any degree the creation of labour belongs to the labourers, or to the community, supposing the labourers to be supreme in it, is a doctrine which has made great way among the French workmen. But, if they had attacked property generally, they would have gained no support except from avowed Socialists. By attacking only ecclesiastical property, such as churches, parsonages, and crucifixes, they enabled the organs of the Extreme Left to describe the riots as merely an injudicious, but pardonable, mode of evincing hatred to a mischievous superstition which is still subsidized, in defiance of consistency and common sense, by a nominally Republican Government. The so-called outrages were simply a too outspoken protest against the Concordat and all that springs from the Concordat. It is said, though we do not know with what truth, that the manager of the Company by which the mines are worked has been in the habit of punishing by dismissal any anti-Catholic manifestation on the part of his workmen, and that he has even treated mere attendance at a funeral conducted without any religious ceremony as an anti-Catholic manifestation. As to the impropriety as well as the folly of this last measure there can be no two opinions; but even this can scarcely be held to justify the *République Française* in classing clericalism and the use of dynamite under the common head of dangers to society, and calling upon the Government to repress them both with an equally firm hand.

It is not, however, the disorders at Montceau and Lyons, or even the terrorism which has been brought to bear upon the witnesses and judges at the trial, that is most likely to injure the Republican Government in the estimation of the country. When the Republic meant the Republic of M. THIERS, the extravagances preached by the Extreme Left did it little or no harm. They were regarded merely as survivals of the Commune which the Republic was as

much interested in suppressing as the monarchical parties themselves. It is impossible to view them in this light any longer. The most careless politician can see that the extravagances of ten, or even five, years ago have become the serious proposals of to-day. The institutions of which M. THIERS constituted himself the defender are one and all assailed, and the only distinction between the men actually in power and those who are waiting to succeed them is that the latter are a little more outspoken. As has been happily said, every Ministry begins by destroying something, and none of them remain long enough in power to set up anything in place of what has been destroyed. As regards disorders like those at Montceau, what confidence can a sober-minded Frenchman feel in the future when he hears M. CLÉMENCEAU spoken of as a politician who will certainly become Prime Minister some day, and then reads in each issue of the journal which bears M. CLÉMENCEAU's name on its front page an exceedingly able and ingenious defence of the accused Socialists by a writer who is himself, we believe, an ex-Communist of 1871? The pleas set up in the *Justice* go much further than a mere attempt to clear the accused of the specific charges brought against them. When the Republicans who wish to see the Montceau rioters severely dealt with are bidden to study the prediction of PRUDHON, "that before fifty years had passed a priest would be prosecuted as a swindler "for the simple exercise of his functions," and to remember that if that "intrepid Socialist and austere moralist" were now living he would understand, pity, and defend the miners of Montceau, it will not be wonderful if men who care little for the form and much for the substance of political institutions begin to ask themselves whether a Republic which is shortly to have M. CLÉMENCEAU for its chief ruler is precisely the Government under which they wish to live.

RIVER COMMUNICATIONS FOR EAST LONDON.

IT is only at intervals that people who live to the West of London Bridge are reminded that to the East of it there is a population of a million and a half which contrives to do a vast amount of work in a very quiet way. At the present moment, and after discussions carried on over several years, it is becoming obvious to everybody that something must be done to enable those who live on the Northern bank to communicate directly with those who live on the Southern. It shows that they are a singularly long-suffering people that a lively popular agitation on the subject has not begun long ago. The population on the North side is equal to that of Manchester, Salford, and Birmingham together, and there is a city as populous as Liverpool opposite to them. Apart from the mere numbers divided by the river, the amount of traffic across it is immense, for these are the busiest parts of London. At present the greater part of it has to come through the City, where the thoroughfares are sufficiently blocked by local traffic. The Eastern districts bear their share of the rates for the existing bridges which are all in the Western. The four miles of London below the bridges have no direct means of communication. At last it appears that a serious attempt is to be made to remedy this state of things. The Metropolitan Board of Works has taken the first step by appointing a Committee to consider the plans for establishing sufficient communication drawn up by their engineer, Sir JOSEPH BAZALGETTE. The Committee has given an opinion that something ought to be done. That was sufficiently obvious to the unofficial mind long ago, and it might seem that something a little more definite was required. But the Committee has perhaps been well advised in leaving to the responsible authority the choice among the various means suggested. It is enough that it has decided that the work must be begun.

The choice of means will not be an easy one. The great army of volunteer advisers who always appear when any public work is to be done will be ready with suggestions. An occasion of this kind gives a remarkably good opening for an advertisement which costs nothing. Engineers are already hurrying to point out in the most disinterested way that, if their particular bridge were accepted, all the difficulties of cost and construction would disappear at once. And the obstacles to the doing of the work are very considerable in themselves. They are of two kinds—the engineering difficulties, and the condition of the buildings on the riverside. It will not be enough to

choose that spot on the banks which is physically fittest, and put the bridge there. The position of the wharves and the direction of existing thoroughfares must be taken into consideration. Modern engineers would make light of the difficulties of constructing a bridge over a much wider stream than the Thames; but it must be made not only over the river, but over the shipping. The lowness of the banks renders it difficult, as far as anything can be difficult to a modern engineer, to make a high-level bridge, and a low-level bridge would stop the traffic. Many plans have been proposed to get over the difficulty, all very plausible at first sight, but all marred by some defect which made them impracticable when they came to be examined. At last a comprehensive scheme has been drawn up by Sir JOSEPH BAZALGETTE which seems likely to prove acceptable. This plan goes far beyond the construction of one bridge. That would not satisfy the needs of East London; and as the work of giving it sufficient means of communication across the Thames is to be undertaken, it should be done thoroughly. Sir JOSEPH proposes to make one high bridge and two tunnels, the first at Little Tower Hill, and the others between Shadwell and Rotherhithe, and between Blackwall and Greenwich. The bridge can be most conveniently made at Little Tower Hill, not only because, if it were put higher, it would be of comparatively little service to East London, but because at that point it can be made without interfering with the docks. It might be put a little lower, at Nightingale Lane; but in that case it would be necessary to undertake great works of improvement in the approaches, which would interfere with the wharves. The London Docks, the Surrey Commercial Docks, the West India Docks, and the Millwall Docks occupy the banks of the river to a point six miles below London Bridge, so that no new bridge can be made except at an immense cost; but the tunnels proposed by Sir J. BAZALGETTE can be conveniently made at Shadwell and Blackwall. The latter would unite the extreme North-east of London with Greenwich, and, considering the rate at which docks and buildings are spreading along the Thames, would soon be in the centre, and not at the end, of a district. The bridge at Little Tower Hill must, in the opinion of the Metropolitan Board of Works engineer, be a high-level one. It would be more convenient for traffic if made at a low level, but it would have the double inconvenience of costing nearly a million more than the other, and interfering seriously with the movement of vessels on the river. And it is maintained that a high-level bridge need not seriously interfere with the land traffic. Sir JOSEPH BAZALGETTE is of opinion that such a bridge, crossing the river in one span, with a clear headway of 85 feet above Trinity high water, with straight inclined approaches, would be a convenient highway. It is probable that his scheme will meet with much criticism. There are so many people with plans of their own, and so many who have committed themselves to the approval of alternative schemes, that there will be no want of fault-finding. But the public will probably be content that any practical scheme should be carried out, since the alternative would seem to be merely endless discussion. The technical merits of the different bridges can only be adequately estimated by engineers, and it is very possible that a better bridge than Sir JOSEPH BAZALGETTE's might be made; but, as nobody seems to deny that his bridge can be made, and no evidence seems to be forthcoming that he is mistaken in supposing that it would be comparatively cheap; and since, above all, it is high time that something should be done, the Board will scarcely be blamed for carrying out his idea. It seems to be sufficiently obvious that the alternative of a ferry or a tunnel at Tower Hill is impracticable.

The difficulties of construction are not the only ones with which the Board of Works will have to contend. As in the case of other great public works intended to facilitate communication, the change is sure to be opposed by a large number of persons who find their account in the present state of things. If the shipping were to be stopped by the proposed bridge at the Tower, or even any considerable part of it, a great change would be made in the conditions under which many of the labourers on the river-bank gain their living. It does not appear, however, that the traffic on the river would be very materially affected by Sir JOSEPH BAZALGETTE's bridge; and, even if it were, the need of new means of communication across the river is so great that the gain to the whole of London would more than counterbalance the

damage done to the men at present employed on the wharves between Tower Hill and London Bridge. The fear that London would cease to be a port, which has been expressed by some, is obviously exaggerated. There is a tendency to take more and more of the traffic down the river, which is wholly independent of the bridge at Tower Hill, and does not in any way affect the prosperity of London. The financial difficulties in the way of carrying out the scheme will perhaps prove more serious than the opposition of the men interested in the docks which seem to be threatened. The calculated cost of the bridge and the two tunnels is over five millions. London is rich enough to spend a larger sum on a necessary work; but when it becomes a question how the money is to be raised an opportunity will be afforded for the discussions which never fail to retard all plans for raising money. Sir JOSEPH BAZALGETTE calculates that a toll of a halfpenny on foot-passengers and a penny on carriages would produce 67.16s. per day, an amount which would pay the interest on the required 5,000,000l., and pay off the debt in a reasonable time. But a toll, though it makes some of those who use bridges or tunnels contribute towards the cost, does not fall on all who profit by them. As the work would be carried out for the general benefit of London, it seems no more than reasonable that the expense should be borne by the whole community.

FREE SCHOOLS AND HIGH SCHOOLS.

THE coming election for the London School Board promises to be of more importance than any of those which have preceded it. Three years ago, when the policy of the Board was challenged and confirmed by a decisive vote, the controversy after all turned mainly upon matters of detail. No one denied in words that the Board was bound to provide elementary education for as many children as were not actually receiving it elsewhere, and no one asserted in words that it was the duty of the Board to do more than provide this. There were differences of opinion upon how the Board ought to treat voluntary schools, and upon the precise subjects that came within the definition of elementary education. But, however these and similar questions might be settled, it was certain that under any circumstances there was abundance of work for the School Board to do, and that the age at which the vast majority of children leave school would of itself prevent them from receiving more than rudimentary instruction. The issues between the majority and the minority on the School Board have been fought with singular acrimony; but how comparatively small they have all the time been may be inferred from Mrs. FENWICK MILLER's speech at the meeting in Farringdon Street on Monday. Mrs. MILLER proposed an amendment to a motion in favour of the action of the Board brought forward by the Governor of the Bank of England. She asked the meeting to pledge itself to support School Board reform on the lines of increased care in expenditure, and, according to the report in the *Times*, "proceeded, in eloquent and persuasive language, 'to denounce the 'School Board ring,' and to arraign the 'Board in regard to the Shafesbury training-ship.'" The truth is, that the language of the minority on the School Board has been a great deal too "eloquent and 'persuasive.'" If they had been less given to calling the majority names, and more careful in watching over the details of the outlay they object to, they might even have kept the cost of ventilating the Board-room within the original estimate. Still, when all, and more than all, the significance that really belongs to them has been given to these disputes, they involve no question of principle. Even the aesthetic member who furnished the *Shafesbury* would not contend that expense should be no object in the fitting out of training-ships; while the most parsimonious educationist would admit that, considering the number of hours the members sometimes have to spend in the Board-room, no sum that is necessary to ventilate it ought to be refused.

There are indications that the elections of next month will turn in part on questions of very much wider interest. The Chairman of the Board said the other day that the proposal to open free schools by way of experiment had been left to the electors to decide, and several letters which have appeared in the *Times* show that they will also have to pronounce on the proposal to open

"higher elementary schools." Mr. BUXTON's own prepossessions are apparently in favour of free schools, and even Mr. FORSTER declared on Monday that there is "much to be said on both sides." When the author of the Elementary Education Act goes the length of admitting that there is much to be said in favour of making a fundamental alteration in it, those who wished to make that alteration when the Bill was still before Parliament are naturally stimulated to further action, and it will be surprising if Mr. FORSTER's concession does not make the question of free schools more prominent than it might otherwise have been. It is very much to the advantage of the proposal that it is put forward in the innocent guise of an experiment. Nobody is frightened by the idea of opening a few free schools just to see how they answer. It is not noticed that to open half a dozen concedes the principle as completely as though every Board school in London were made free. The objection to free schools may be sound or worthless, but it is not an objection that can be solved by experiment. The points which can be settled in that way relate only to the educational aspect of the change. No amount of experiments can lessen the force of the social objection. Hitherto the poor have had but one legal claim on the community—the claim arising from destitution. In its own interest and for its own ends the State has proclaimed that no man shall be left to starve. When it was made compulsory upon parents to give their children a minimum of education, the difficulty how very poor parents were to pay even for this minimum at once arose, and, as usual, it was got over by a compromise. In strict logic no distinction ought to have been made between educational and any other kind of destitution. When Parliament had determined what necessaries a parent should be compelled to give his child, inability to give them should have made him a pauper. Mr. FORSTER was not prepared to go this length, and the result was that the Guardians or the School Boards were directed to pay or remit the school fees in the case of parents who are unable to pay them, without their being regarded as paupers. For the first time the community relieved something else than sheer inability to keep body and soul together. Where school fees were concerned indigence became as good a plea as destitution. The idea of education being provided without the parent contributing anything to the cost thus became familiar, and the result of that familiarity is seen in the agitation for free schools. If a few are set up in London, the day when all elementary schools will be free cannot be far off. It will be impossible to get parents to pay school fees after they have once seen them abolished, and it will be equally impossible to limit the benefit to a few arbitrarily chosen districts. After all, it will be said, it will only raise the rate by a penny in the pound; and if there be any number of ratepayers to whom even this increase is an object, they will be asked to comfort themselves by the reflection that, though they pay a little more, they get far better value for their money. The one thing, therefore, for the ratepayers of London to consider in relation to free schools is that it is a question of all or none. It is impossible that free schools and paying schools should long exist side by side when the circumstances of the parents and the education given to the children are substantially identical. Nor will it be practicable to make a distinction between parents who can and parents who cannot pay the fees without inconvenience. The rates, it must be remembered, will be mainly levied on the former class. It is not the poor, but those just above the poor, that form the bulk of the contributors to the education rate; and if any schools are free, the actual ratepayers will certainly insist that the schools which their children attend shall be among the number.

It is not only in the matter of free schools that the London School Board seem anxious to prove how far they can go in the direction of an amiable socialism. There is another project much in favour with them which has precisely the same tendency. The Board now proposes to set up "higher elementary schools," in which the more intelligent children may remain to a somewhat later age than they can well be kept in an ordinary elementary school, and receive a proportionately better education. The very name which these schools are to bear shows the confusion of thought in which they have their origin. A higher elementary school is something like a luxurious necessary of life. Elementary education, if words are

to have any meaning, stands for that minimum of rudimentary instruction which the State has decreed every parent shall be compelled to give his children, together with such additional teaching as can be conveyed in the process of imparting this minimum. Anything above this is secondary education. These higher schools are avowedly meant to teach more than the rudiments, and to teach them to older children than are found in elementary schools. They are intended, in fact, not for poor children, but for children who, as the term is usually understood, belong to the middle classes. This is shown by the fee it is proposed to charge—9d. a week—and by the fact that the parents can afford to keep their children at school for some two or three years after the children of the poor are at work. We have nothing but praise for the desire to set up schools of this kind. Secondary education stands now in far greater need of improvement than elementary education, and we should welcome with delight any well-considered scheme for the voluntary maintenance of secondary schools, for the application to their use of many endowments now allowed to run to waste, and even for aiding them out of public funds, as in the case of any other object of great public interest. What is objectionable in the scheme of the London School Board is that it diverts funds intended for elementary education from their original purpose; that it spends these funds, not on secondary education generally, but on a particular type of secondary school, which, moreover, is described by a wholly misleading title; that it applies a rate levied on the whole community for the benefit of an arbitrarily chosen section of it; and that it gives time and thought to the working out of these mistaken ends which are not more than sufficient for the proper discharge of the Board's special and most arduous duties. If we are to set up a system of secondary education at the cost of the nation, let us at least take care that it is comprehensive in its scope, fair in its incidence, and entrusted to competent hands. The ambitious good intentions of the London School Board fulfil none of these essential conditions.

A FRENCH CRITIC ON WORDSWORTH.

THREE years ago Mr. Arnold, in the "gracieuse préface," as M. Scherer justly styles it, to his selections from Wordsworth's poetry, was forced to the melancholy admission that on the Continent the poet was still "almost unknown." Even M. Taine could find little more to say about him than that he was a "poet of the twilight," a "new Cowper, with less talent and more ideas"; and through the half-dozen pages which he bestows on him, he treats him generally with a good deal of that ignorance, and not a little of that impertinence, which Mr. Arnold complains certain of our own "tenth-rate critics and compilers" still permit themselves to employ in speaking of Wordsworth's poetry. M. Scherer, one of the few living Frenchmen who are very well acquainted with other modern languages than their own, has determined that, so far as he and France are concerned, this reproach (and he allows that it is a grave reproach) shall no longer exist. "Really," he says, "we must no longer allow illustrious names never to be mentioned in France merely because they happen to be the names of foreigners, or to be mentioned without conveying at least some more precise idea than at present." Accordingly, he set to work in the *Temps* to give his countrymen some more precise idea of a poet who is "indisputably one of the great names in English literature," a poet who, in his judgment, as in the judgment of Mr. Arnold, ranks next to Milton, "notably below him, but still the first after him." In the latest volume of his *Studies on Contemporary Literature* these papers are reprinted, and among such various subjects of study as Carlyle, M. Taine, Lord Beaconsfield, M. Renan, Sainte-Beuve, and M. Zola, Wordsworth is seen to occupy the first and by far the most conspicuous place.

Some of M. Scherer's English critics do not quite know what to make of him. He seems to puzzle them a little, and, as a natural consequence, he sometimes irritates them not a little. With some, indeed, he stands very high. Notably with Mr. Arnold, who regards him (may we say, with perhaps one exception?) as the first of living critics, on whose shoulders has fallen no inconsiderable portion of the mantle of Sainte-Beuve. In Mr. Arnold's eyes he is an "exceptional Frenchman," and as "he knows thoroughly the language and literature of England, Italy, Germany, as well as of France," so far it is probable that every one will go along with Mr. Arnold. He is praised, too, for his open-mindedness, his firmness, and sureness of judgment, though it is allowed he has not quite the elasticity and cheerfulness of his illustrious predecessor. It is in no spirit of impertinence, but rather a humiliating confession of national ignorance (though we are pleased to see that M. Scherer considers us to be far less sinners in this respect than his own countrymen), that we hazard the suggestion that, if it had not been for Mr. Arnold's praise and the practical form that praise took in his

review of M. Scherer's criticisms on Milton and Goethe, many of us here in England, purblind creatures that we are, had never heard at all of this exceptional Frenchman, or, as he says is the case in France with Wordsworth, had not learned to attach any very precise idea to his name. This is another of the debts our generation owes to Mr. Arnold, for it is certain that, whatever may be the sum of our agreement with him, or our difference, at least no one can read M. Scherer without getting some benefit from him, if it be only that benefit which Gibbon says may be derived as much from opposition as from agreement in ideas. M. Scherer is, no doubt, conscious of the good turn Mr. Arnold has done him, and to that we may perhaps in part attribute the elaborate encomium on his English admirer which occupies so conspicuous a position in his study of Wordsworth, and may possibly prove to some English readers the most interesting part of it. And, allowing for that inevitable mixture of enchantment which distance lends to every object, whether man or mountain, there is very little in M. Scherer's praise at which we should for our part be disposed to cavil. Cynics perhaps may smile when they find our apostle of the grand manner described as "*le plus simple et le moins affecté des hommes*," and many who are not cynics will certainly stare when they read that he is "*fort éloigné de s'attribuer une mission quelconque*." But, on the whole, few Englishmen, save perhaps some translators of Homer, or the *Quarterly Reviewer* who is so angry with Mr. Arnold for ranking Wordsworth above Byron, or the editor of *Punch*, who is so angry at being told to get lucidity, are likely to deny that M. Scherer's compliments are, if elaborate, at least sincere, and in the main just.

But concerning M. Scherer himself there is, as we have said, a great diversity of opinion. The other day he was likened by a contemporary to "a French Principal Shairp," and it was to be gathered from the context that the comparison was not intended to be complimentary. He is accused of "a remarkable inability to appreciate what he does not like," of "a reasonableness which is so extremely reasonable that it sometimes forgets to be anything else." These accusations are perhaps a little vague. It must surely first be shown that he is unjust in his dislikes before he can be blamed for a want of appreciating what he dislikes. The fact is, that M. Scherer's method of criticism is directly opposed to the method that is still so largely in vogue at the present day. Despite all the vauntings of our new *apparatus criticus*, all our sneers at the old, the greater part of contemporary criticism is still as surely made up of "personal sensations of like and dislike" as it ever was in the days of Jeffrey and Macaulay. We have learnt, no doubt, to "moderate the transports of our tongue," to express our likings and dislikings with a little more temperance and sobriety than did the young lions of the *Quarterlies* in the early days of the century. But are we not pretty nearly as "cock-sure" as they were, though in a different way? We assume the virtue of humility perhaps with more parade than they ever cared to show, but we all know what place in the catalogue of sins a certain distinguished personage has given to "the pride which apes humility." Whatever we may think, whatever we may say, we have not really made any appreciable advance towards reasonableness. In our actual treatment of the subject under review we have perhaps done so; but to those who decline to make use of our spectacles we are every whit as unreasonable as were the most headstrong of those fathers of ours at whom we are so pleased to sneer. To the exuberant young eulogists who play at criticism to-day, no doubt so clear-headed a writer as M. Scherer will appear too "reasonable." They will look to see what he says of Milton, and they will find that "not one reader in a hundred can read the ninth and tenth books of *Paradise Lost* without smiling, or the eleventh and twelfth without yawning"; they will find that Byron "dresses up in a caftan and turban the sombre humours of a worn-out man of the world"; they will find that Wordsworth "not only parades enthusiasm for flowers and birds, but predilection for beggars, cripples, and idiots"; that Carlyle is something of a buffoon, and the author of *Endymion* not a little of a charlatan. On such and yet more terrible profanities they may very well light in turning over M. Scherer's pages, and they will want no more; they will fling the book from them in disgust, and turn for solace to their favourite rhapsodists, who will receive them with open arms, and tell them that Rossetti is the equal of Dante, and Victor Hugo of Shakespeare. The fact is that M. Scherer has that dangerous gift—the most dangerous and the most unpardonable that a critic can have for those who disagree with him—the gift of being able to see the faults as well as the virtues of his subject.

Certainly he sees plenty of faults in Wordsworth. He sees so many, indeed, that the *Quarterly Reviewer*, save for M. Scherer's conclusion that Wordsworth ranks next to Milton, avows himself ready to agree with every word of an essay which he declares, in the transports of his enthusiasm (for this Reviewer thinks not very nobly of Wordsworth), to tend by every argument and every phrase towards a "diametrically opposite conclusion." But this is by no means so; and, when the Reviewer makes use of so random an assertion, he only shows his possession of a faculty very common with the critic, the faculty which Johnson characteristically describes as not easily missing what one desires to find. In point of fact, M. Scherer's view of Wordsworth is very much Mr. Arnold's—a fact which, no doubt, has contributed its share to his admiration for our "exceptional Englishman." It is true he goes a little further in his fault-finding, and not quite so far in his praise; and, no doubt, a superficial reader of his words might be inclined to agree that he has not sufficiently justified his conclusion that

Wordsworth is "de l'étoffe dont sont faits les immortels," and is to be ranked first among English poets after Milton. But the reader who goes to M. Scherer, not to get his own opinions confirmed, but to find what M. Scherer's are, and especially a reader who is acquainted with his critic's method, will see that this is not really so. He has little more admiration for Wordsworth's philosophy than has Mr. Arnold. "Scarcely," he says, "should we dare to call him a philosopher, so wanting in him is the reasoning and speculative element. Even the title of thinker only half becomes him; 'he is a contemplative.'" He finds, too, that Wordsworth could produce, and did produce in too large quantities, work "quite uninspired, flat, and dull"; and he finds, too, that most of this work is in his longer poems, *The Excursion* and *The Prelude*. Despite some indisputable beauties, he says, one cannot read them through without a sense of weariness; "ils sont un peu lourds et monotones." Hence a suspicion of weariness has become attached to the name of Wordsworth, and has cramped his fame. The fact is, he goes on, that our poet's system, his very genius, inevitably puts him at a disadvantage when he writes without the help and the constraint of rhyme. His blank verse has often sublimity both of thought and language, but that sublimity is generally reached by a direct infraction of his own poetic principles. He has, in short, as Mr. Arnold says, fine Miltonic lines and phrases, and fine lines, too, in his own manner. Many of these M. Scherer quotes, and always with praise; but he also finds too many of those "leagues of lumbering movement" which so sadly distress the lover of Wordsworth, and serve so cruelly to point the sneers of the *Quarterly Reviewer*. Simplicity, naturalness of thought and language—this, says M. Scherer, was Wordsworth's poetic creed. "He renounced the artificial diction of the classical school, their antithesis, and their profusion of epithets, attempting to make up for baldness of form by the charm of a sentiment absolutely sincere, and by the novelty of a language absolutely natural." But he could not always do this. The simplicity of his subject too often degenerated into triviality; the simplicity of his style too often into poverty. His subject had not always in itself the natural charm; it was not always *simplex munditiis*, but sometimes *simplex immunditiis*. Employed on such subjects, absolute sincerity of sentiment and absolute naturalness of language could not but be bald and trivial. Hence it is that Wordsworth's poetry, with its inevitable tendency to the prosaic, sinks sometimes into it altogether, and we get such writing as—

Meanwhile the Evangelists, Isaiah, Job,
Moses, and he who penned the other day
The death of Abel—

of which Milton has given us the very foil and counterpart in his
Blind Thamyris and blind Maenides,
And Tiresias and Phineus, prophets old;—
or such as
A travelling cripple, by the trunk cut short,
And stumping on his arms;

or as Mr. Arnold's enemy,
And at the "Hoop" alighted, famous inn;
to say nothing of all those desperate platitudes in which the fervent Wordsworthian finds the really precious part of his master's work, the "scientific system of thought," that sweet union of philosophy and poetry, which for so many years these indiscreet disciples have been trying to palm off on the world as Wordsworth's noblest title to praise, and which as a natural consequence has tended only to create in so many minds a false impression of his real work, and even, as M. Scherer says, to attach a sense of dulness to his very name.

Our French critic, then, finds fault enough in all conscience; nevertheless, his final estimate is, as we have seen, a high one, nor is it true that he contents himself with a bare assertion. The philosophy of Wordsworth and his didactic moralizing he cannot away with; he admits to the full that the poet has little knowledge of the human heart or of the world; love and hate and burning thoughts, sublime melancholies, audacious revolts, "le drame intérieur des passions," are alike unknown to him. None of these things can Wordsworth give us, but something else he can and does give, something which, in Mr. Arnold's words, we may rest upon more surely and more lastingly than on these. And M. Scherer strikes the very keynote of Wordsworth's real praise when he calls him "un écrivain bienfaisant qui élève et qui rend heureux." No truer criticism could there be than this, and none more after the poet's own heart; for it is in this, in the power of making men wiser, better, and happier, that he himself has placed the real greatness of poetry:—

Blessings be with them, and eternal praise,
Who gave us nobler loves and nobler cares,
The Poets who on earth have made us heirs
Of truth and pure delight by heavenly lays.

THE INFLUENCE OF EDUCATION ON OBSERVATION.

IT was lately remarked in these columns that one of the dangers attendant on education was that it might lessen men's powers of observation. There is no doubt, we apprehend, that this possibility does exist. Bookishness and absence of mind are no new faults among students. Among the more cultivated classes they have, indeed, been for a considerable time in process of diminution, and the last half-century more particularly has seen a great

change in this respect. Physical science has roused students, who in former ages would have been abstract thinkers and nothing more, to careful and steady observation of external things. Facilities of travelling have acted as another stimulus in the same direction; and the love of nature has been a power over sentimental minds, and has led them insensibly from a quiet enjoyment of their surroundings to more active investigation. So that altogether the classes which at the present day have the advantage of the higher education are far more observant than were their forerunners of three or four centuries ago; and, though even now many of the mathematicians and philosophers who walk the streets of our Universities live largely in a mood of abstract thought, we must be careful of finding undue fault with this, for the inward eye has some claims not lightly to be despised. But, with respect to the mass of the nation, the question we have raised is one that deserves a good deal of attention. Popular education is still in the bookish stage; and, without complaining of what is inevitable, we may and ought to inquire whether literary study does now in the lower ranks promote that vice of inobservance which it certainly promoted in the higher ranks a century or two ago. Equally we have to inquire whether the virtue which is the converse of this error may be fostered; whether and how the study of books may be made to minister to powers of direct observation, instead of being adverse to them, and to assist in the general business of life.

Literary study may conceivably impede our observant faculties, either by suggesting problems that appear to demand pure thinking alone for their solution, or by imbuing the mind with an ambitious tone, in which the ordinary events of everyday experience are looked upon as unworthy of notice. In the latter case it must be acting mischievously; in the former case it may be mischievous, though it is not always so. If a problem is really of a purely abstract character, it is inevitable that external observation should be lulled during the investigation of it. Newton was in many respects an inobservant, absent-minded man; but without that inobservance he could not have been the master of abstract thought that he was, or have made the discoveries that have been so powerfully beneficial to the human race. But there are many problems which have an appearance of being abstract, and soluble by pure thought alone, in which this is by no means really the case. Questions of ethics, of political economy, of art, are of this nature; they have a delusive appearance of abstraction from the actual world in which we live; and many an inquirer has gone round and round in them in a profitless circle, without being aware that the element needed to render him successful was not brain power at all, but experience of men and things. The danger, however, that the faculties of observation may be blunted by an excess of abstract thought is not very great in the popular education of the present day. But the danger that they may be blunted by mistaken ambition is a real one. The clever and educated poor will at times despise the common incidents of daily life, in comparison with that larger sphere to which books give them an introduction in imagination, though not in reality. Housekeepers find that servants neglect the pots and pans and dishes, cannot find anything when it is wanted, cannot see cobwebs in the corners or dust upon the shelves and tables, while their attention is devoted to the pleasures of literature in some, very often questionable, form. Farmers, we have been told, complain of the degeneracy of ploughboys from the same cause. True, farmers are a complaining race, and their misfortunes of late years may have made them more querulous than usual; but their testimony should not be quite disregarded. Some considerable application of the maxim that people should do their duty in their own station will be found to give no unneeded help to the observant faculties at a time of large general progress, when hopes and ideas are apt to be extensive and vague.

But it is not enough that education should refrain from hindering the faculties of observation; it ought, if it is sound, actually to promote and enlarge those faculties. How this may be done is a problem not without difficulty. While the fault of inobservance is simple and single in its nature, the virtue of ready observation is complex, relating to many different spheres; he who possesses it in one sphere may lack it in another. When Thales, looking at the stars, tumbled into a well that lay before his feet, he was partly very inobservant, partly very observant; by the one quality he doubtless incommoded himself grievously, by the other he discovered how to predict eclipses, saved mankind from a certain amount of irrational panic, and won for himself a great reputation. To Thales the balance was for good; but it would not be safe to affirm that this would be the case with every one who walked with his head in the air looking at the stars.

Thus the direction in which observation may be most usefully practised varies with the circumstances of the case; with the circumstances of the pupil when education is in question; and is not the same in the different ranks of society. The problem has, we think, been most successfully solved at present in the Colleges, more or less recently founded, of our great Northern towns. There, physical science is in demand for practical purposes, and educational institutions accommodate themselves to the demand. But in the elder Universities and the elementary schools alike, an equal measure of solution has not yet been attained. Oxford and Cambridge students (to begin with the higher rank) have not, as a rule, any plain and visible necessity for physical science as an aid in their future employments. But there is another side of science besides the immediately practical one—a side which ought to be held of especial value in im-

stitutions that have under their survey the largest interests of humanity. The great sciences of observation—astronomy, geology, and the natural history of animals and plants—are more noticeable for their ideal than for their practical side, though they do touch on practice also. They give sublime views on the universe, such as it is a refreshment and consolation to possess, and such as touch not remotely on the destiny and happiness of man. We in England, at any rate, are not hopeless of the reconciliation of these views with the religious ideal that we have received. But it is the apparent collision, on certain points, between the new and the old that has impeded the reception of these sciences in those respects in which they are so calculated to elicit human feeling, and therefore so appropriate as studies in our elder and chief Universities. In astronomy, indeed, the collision with religion has been long ago practically surmounted. But the observational side of astronomy has been rather sunk at Cambridge and Oxford in comparison with its mathematical side. It may be suspected that many students of astronomy (though not astronomers proper) have less knowledge of the actual face of the heavens than had those Chaldean shepherds who roamed the plains of the East thousands of years ago, in whom the science originated.

When we come to the poorer extreme of society, though the elementary education of the country does not quite ignore the cultivation of the observant faculties, neither does it, in our opinion, lay sufficient stress upon them. The arts of reading and writing, and the study of arithmetic, taken simply by themselves, have a tendency to withdraw the mind from the outer world, and it needs a corrective to restore the balance. That corrective may, in certain cases, be supplied by the subject-matter of the books read, if it is required that they shall be intelligently understood. At the same time, such a requirement must be very positive and direct in order not to be evaded. Though the Education Department does at the present moment require from children in elementary schools, not merely an intelligent style of reading, but also (in the upper standards) an acquaintance with the subject-matter of the books read, it would naturally be felt to be extremely hard that a child should be declared to have failed in reading because he or she showed a want of proper observation. But we should like to see this whole topic of intelligent acquaintance with the subject-matter of the books read removed from the mere art of reading, and constituted into a separate subject by itself—say into a class subject, such as geography and grammar are now. If this were done, it would not be hard upon a child to demand from it some amount of observation as well as intelligence. If, for instance, the reading-book referred to any agricultural operation, such as harvesting, or to some well-known plant or flower or vegetable, or to cattle, or to birds, whether migratory or permanent in the country, then in a country school the children might fairly be questioned so as to bring out what they themselves had observed on these matters. In a town school questions might be asked on other matters to which reading-books would also now and then make reference; railways, stations, the different public buildings and their uses, the trades or manufactures specially practised in the town. We cannot but think that there is a real gap in the training of children in the poorer classes, and that the step we here recommend might do much to fill it.

It is true, and we note the fact with pleasure, that the Education Department has of late encouraged methods of teaching geography which bring out that side in which it is connected with direct observation. The suggestion that in every school the meridian line should be marked on the floor, in order that the points of the compass may be practically known, is a valuable one in this direction. Still more so is the suggestion, almost amounting to a requirement, that "good maps of the parish or immediate neighbourhood in which the school is situated should be affixed to the walls." But of course the value of these appliances depends on the way in which they are used. The meridian line may be marked with exactness, the map of the parish may be unexceptionable, but if the knowledge of these points is not interwoven with the daily teaching it will be fruitless. And we cannot but regret that the Education Department should treat geography as a subject inferior in importance to grammar. This is to place the abstract before the concrete, which is contrary to all natural and true method. We are sure that it needs far greater skill to render a grammar lesson really fruitful and beneficial than to render a geography lesson so. When grammar is made almost a necessity, while geography is distinctly not a necessity, how is it possible but that geography must go to the wall? There is, indeed, another class subject recognized by the Education Department in their New Code which would cultivate observation even more, perhaps, than geography does—namely, elementary science. But we presume it is the opinion of the Department itself (as it certainly is our own) that this subject will not be largely used; for in the recently issued "Instructions to Inspectors" it is passed over very cursorily, without the least indication as to the parts of natural science to be preferred, or any more than the vaguest as to methods. Elementary science will have a very uphill battle to fight if it is to win any real recognition, where the recognition of it involves the discarding of the more familiar geography, which by the terms of the Code it does. But our fear is that geography and elementary science will alike play but a poor part, in view of the superior importance and extended meaning given to grammar in the New Code. And while some of the "specific subjects" of the Code are such as would encourage the observant faculties, these subjects are taken up by so small a number of children as hardly to affect the broad question we are discussing.

A suggestion, however, has been made which, if it could be carried out, would undoubtedly bring popular education into more direct relations with the external world, and therefore encourage the observant faculties more than is the case at present. This is that, just as girls are taught needlework, so boys should in the course of their education be taught some elements of their future practical work in life. This has especially been urged in the interests of agriculture, and it has been thought that boys might be taught, while still at school, so much of the rudiments of farming as would greatly improve their future capacity. Of this proposal we can only say that we should be glad if it could be found practicable, but we are afraid the difficulties of connecting practical farming with school work would be found very great. It might be easier to bring gardening into the school routine. But all that can here be said is that this suggestion, like all others that tend to relieve popular education from mere formalizing, deserves attention; and that if the difficulties which it appears to present could be got over, it would certainly be a great benefit to the country.

DUELING DRAMAS.

ONE of the most interesting and curious of modern additions to the literature of duelling is afforded by M. Théodore de Graves's *Les Drames de l'Epée*, to which M. Jules Claretie has written a preface which in its own way is equally interesting. M. Claretie begins by accusing his comrades of the pen in plays, romances, and feuilletons, of being the people who are responsible for the practice of duelling—"cette habitude assez brutale"—being still kept alive in France. But for the constant employment of the duel on the stage and in romances, he thinks it would have died out long ago. Unluckily it is so extremely convenient a thing for the purposes of the stage and of romances, that it is not likely that M. Claretie's protest will do much good. M. Claretie goes on to dwell upon various popular delusions concerning duelling, amongst them that in a duel justice inevitably triumphs. "Mélingue in his career discomfited so many traitors, and so many fifth acts have seen the deaths of so many heavy villains at the hands of young heroes who have never handled a sword before, that this idea has taken root in the popular fancy—Courage and good cause will triumph over any adversary." A good cause, observes M. Claretie, will cut but a poor figure on the ground with only six months' training to back it; and in a duel the life of the best man in the world, who is no fencer, is at the mercy of any ruffian who has studied the art. However, this is the less important because, M. Claretie thinks, the vogue of the duel is rapidly declining, and it will be laughed out of France as it was laughed out of England. Whether, supposing M. Claretie to be right, this is a matter for absolutely unmixed satisfaction is a question we need not enter upon. One thing is tolerably certain, that it will take a very long time to laugh it off the stage and out of novels.

M. de Graves's very curious and amusing book deals, to a very great extent, with the fortunes of a club which was formed at Bordeaux in the 1830 period, under the name of the *Fraternelle*, for the sole purpose of exterminating the professional bullies and duellists—the *bretteurs*, as they were called—who infested the place and made the lives of wives and mothers an unceasing anxiety. There are still *bretteurs*, M. Claretie tells us; but as the new romanticists are but the shadow of the *chevelus* of 1830, so is the modern *bretteur* but a poor creature to those who practised the coup du Colonel Zanzechi or the coup du cochon. The first of these, known also, as M. Claretie omits to state, as the botte de Nevers, consisted in fixing your point just between your adversary's eyebrows; the second took its name from the fact that the point severed the artery beneath the ear. M. Claretie goes on to tell a story of what befell one of these *bretteurs* who managed to pick a quarrel with an "honnête bourgeois" who occupied the same room with him at an inn. "We will fight to-morrow," said the duellist. "On the contrary, we will fight now," replied the bourgeois; and, attacking the bully with his fists, beat him into a mummy. "We will do this," he added, "as often as you like"; and next day the knight of the foil left the town. Later on M. Claretie tells again the pleasing story of the duel between Sainte-Beuve and Dubois of the *Globe*. Sainte-Beuve appeared upon the ground with a pistol of the time of Francis I., and holding an umbrella (it poured with rain) over his head. To all protestations he answered, "Gentlemen, M. Dubois has undertaken to kill me to-day. Very well, I am willing to be killed, but I will not get wet." Sainte-Beuve's opinion as to duelling is shared by M. de Graves, who has the best possible right to his opinion, and by M. Claretie, who sums up the matter with "Le duel est nain ou il est atroce." The strange club, on whose authentic records M. de Graves has founded a book which has a curious likeness to Mr. Stevenson's purely inventive *New Arabian Nights*, had, it seems, a forerunner called the Spadassiniades, in 1790, at the head of which was M. Boyer, whose address and quality of captain of a band of fifty Spadassiniades is published "dans le No. 82 des Révoltes de Prudhomme du 29 janvier au février 1791." Later on, as late as the days of Benjamin Constant, we find something like the conditions of editorial life in the Far West prevailing in Paris. Both Constant and a friend of his, a retired Colonel, who was a shareholder and collaborator in his paper, were weary of continual challenges and duels, and set to work to find some one who should do the editorial fighting. Such a one was found in an old soldier, who had served

under the Colonel, and who said when the place was offered to him that he must consult his wife. "You have a wife?" said the Colonel. "Yes, sir, and three children." "In that case let us talk no more of it. I will find you something else to do." The soldier, however, whom the Colonel assumed to be a good fencer, insisted; his wife consented; and he took the place. Two duels came quickly upon him, and in both he was wounded, and thoroughly well looked after by Constant and the Colonel, who showered presents upon his wife and children. A third duel came, and the Colonel said, "Come, no child's play this time. One, two, and down with your man." The old soldier was wounded again, and the Colonel asked him, "What has happened to you, Vincent? You, a 'vieux de la veille,' to be three times running worsted like this!" "Ah, mon Colonel," Vincent replied, "what can you expect? I had nothing to do, I had a wife and three children; you offered me this place, which is well paid. I took it. But, as for fencing, I know nothing whatever about it." "Voilà cette fois," says M. Claretie, "du vrai courage," and he does not seem to be far wrong.

The club of the *Fraternelle*, with which M. de Graves deals, was, as has been said, founded in the 1830 period in Bordeaux, and the things which led to its being founded were such things as these. The Comte de Larilliére, one of the well-born among the *bretteurs*, met one day in the street a business man named Castera walking with his young and pretty wife. He advanced to him, and said, with a polite bow, "I beg your pardon, but I have made a bet with my friend here, whom I beg to introduce to you, that I would kiss your wife while she was walking with you"—here the other man turned livid—"after having given you a slap in the face." Castera fought him next day with pistols. The Count's first shot hit Castera on the right ear, his second on the left. Before the third he said, "Cette fois je ferai mouche," and with the third he shot Castera through the eye. Castera was avenged in a manner dramatic enough. One night, as Larilliére, sat in his favourite seat in a café, while a masked ball was going on hard by, a stranger in a domino and mask came up to him, overthrew his glass of punch, and ordered a glass of orgeat instead. Larilliére, for the first time in his life, turned pale and cried, "You scoundrel, you don't know who I am." "Oh yes," the stranger replied, "I know who you are quite well," and with the words forced him down into the chair from which he had risen. The orgeat was brought, and the stranger, holding a pistol to Larilliére's head, said, "Unless you drink this off I shall blow out your brains on the spot; if you do drink it off, I will do you the honour of fighting you to-morrow." "With the sabre," cried Larilliére, who had lately been practising with that arm. "How you like," said the stranger. Then, as Larilliére drank off the orgeat, he added, "I have humbled you enough to-night. I put off killing you till to-morrow." The morrow came, the adversaries met, and Larilliére found that he had met his match. The stranger left him not a moment's breathing space; but never followed up his attack, until at last Larilliére cried insolently, "When are you going to kill me?" "Now," said the stranger, for the first time using his sabre like a duelling sword, and lunging straight through Larilliére's heart. Masses were said in the churches of Bordeaux for this man, who kept his name secret, and who had rid the town of its scourge. This, however, was before the days of the *Fraternelle*; and yet more terrible duels took place before the *Fraternelle* was founded. One was between the two principal *bretteurs* of the place, and was a duel which began, without witnesses, in a bedroom, and was continued from time to time until Claveau, having deliberately killed his infamous friend, accomplice, and subsequently enemy, the Marquis de Lignano, in a pistol duel, ended his own career by suicide. In one of the duels with swords between them, Claveau, who had good reason for hating the Marquis, made a feint at his breast and nailed his right foot to the ground with his sword. Another series of remarkable duels took place later on in the latter days of the *Fraternelle* between its president, M. de Capaillan, and a mysterious German baron. At the first encounter no sooner was the word "Partez" given than Capaillan fell helpless with a wound in the chest. "It was simply a straight lunge," said the other coolly. Capaillan was a fine swordsman, like the friends who had accompanied him, and they were all puzzled and angry, though there was no suspicion of trickery on the part of the German. As soon as Capaillan had recovered they met again, and exactly the same thing happened again. A third time Capaillan challenged the German, and this time he parried the fatal lunge delivered the moment the word was given. For a few seconds the two swords met and avoided each other with lightning rapidity. Then the baron lunged and touched Capaillan on the upper arm; Capaillan dropped on his right knee, and "porta un coup de seconde bas, allonge furieusement le bras, et frappa son ennemi en pleine poitrine." The end, like the beginning, of this story is quite dramatic enough to warrant the title given to M. de Graves's book; but as much may be said of every story in the volume, which is full of strange adventures, and which throws a curious light upon the state of things to which the *bretteurs* reduced society. The *Fraternelle* was dissolved when an order was made against all secret societies; but its last act of self-assertion was terrible enough, and with it died also, except for such existence as M. Claretie says they still have, the race of *bretteurs*.

THE DUNECHT SACRILEGE.

THE stealing and recovery of the late Lord Crawford's body has for many months rejoiced the hearts of the composers and readers of newspaper placards as a "mystery." But perhaps there has been nothing more mysterious about it than the comments of which, in more places than one, the sentence on the man Soutar has been made the occasion. It has been insinuated, if not directly asserted, that Lord Craighill's sentence was excessive, and that its excess was due to the fact that the persons aggrieved were persons of rank and consideration. It is difficult to believe that any man of education and intelligence can share the silly and vulgar prejudice which seems thus to be appealed to. It is more difficult to believe that any man of honour, not sharing the prejudice, could be content to appeal to it. Yet the choice seems to lie between the two suppositions, unless a third—to the effect that political and social cant has such an influence over some persons that neither intelligence nor education nor honour can get a hearing—be preferred as at once more probable and more charitable. To any one who considers the facts, the reasons of Lord Craighill's sentence are at once apparent, and it is equally apparent that they would have been as operative in the case of a rich manufacturer as in the case of the representative of the "Tiger-earl" of a good many centuries back. If any hasty person says that this still leaves a difference in the administration of justice between rich and poor, he only betrays the abiding influence of the same prejudice. For it is only in the case of rich men that the crime of which Soutar was convicted is to be feared. In no other case is there any inducement to commit it. Now that difficulties in the way of ordinary anatomical investigations have been removed, a dead body, *qua* dead body, is certainly not an acquisition worth pains and labour, let alone risk. There must be some further inducement than its commercial value to lead the criminal to commit an act against which even the most rudimentary sense of human decency revolts. The cases in which pure spite, or some other motive of a similar nature, could operate, must be so rare and so abnormal that they are hardly worth considering, and besides, as may easily be shown, Soutar's case excludes itself from this category. The motive may in all such cases be taken to be the desire to extort money; and in all such cases, whatever their differences, the law of civilized countries invariably and justly inflicts very heavy penalties. The rationale of punishment depends upon the power of the fear of it to overbalance temptation; and as the temptation, from the black-mail point of view, to commit this particular crime in such a case as the Crawford case is unusually strong, so the punishment meted out in such a case ought to be unusually heavy. The *τυφλωπός* of classical times violated the tomb in search of direct gain; the *τυφλωπός* of modern times violates it in search of profit to be obtained more indirectly. It is the business of the persons concerned to disappoint him of his gains by refusing to negotiate, and the Crawford family have discharged this duty. It is the business of law to insure him, on the other hand, a signal punishment if he is caught, and Lord Craighill has in this way discharged his duty likewise. One is almost ashamed to urge considerations so obvious; but the fact that they have been ignored makes the enforcement of them necessary.

The further question of the sufficiency of the proofs of Soutar's guilt is independent altogether of the question of the appropriateness of his sentence. There is, indeed, a curiously illogical feeling which often makes itself evident in juries, and is doubtless largely shared by outsiders, to the effect that in a clearly established case the culprit ought to be punished heavily, but that in one which is less clearly established some mitigation of punishment is desirable. Of course neither law nor logic can take account of this singular fancy. For either a man is innocent and ought not to be punished at all, or else he is guilty and ought to receive his due meed of punishment. In Soutar's case the guilt may be said to be indubitable, but the circumstances which established it were certainly very unusual. How weak the defence was may be judged from the facts that the very learned and distinguished counsel with whom the benevolence of Scotch law provides needy prisoners were content to call no evidence; that they hardly disputed the evidence for the Crown; and that they confined themselves to the attempt to prove that the prisoner's story and the facts were compatible with innocence. This line of advocacy always indicates a forlorn hope, because it does not exclude the counter argument that the facts, if not the story, are also compatible with, and more probably the consequence of, guilt. But with all deference to the learned Dean of Faculty and ex-Solicitor-General for Scotland, we doubt very much whether any jurymen in the possession of ordinary intelligence could be expected to admit that the facts were compatible with innocence. That Soutar had been in the employment of the late Earl of Crawford and had been dismissed as a dubious character ought, no doubt, not to be urged too much against him, but it is certainly not a fact in his favour. His subsequent conduct seems equally irreconcileable with the idea of complete innocence and with the story that the threats of the actual criminals made him at worst an accessory after the fact. It seems to be admitted that—strange as it may appear—the theft of the body would not have been known of itself until the next occasion, possibly many years hence, for entering the vault had occurred, if it had not been for the joggings administered by anonymous letters, and, at last, for the ostentatious disturbance of the vault, which could have had no object but to call attention to the act committed months before. It seems not to be disputed that the anonymous, or

rather pseudonymous, letters in question came from Soutar. It is positively proved that he made mysterious allusions to the matter, and at last directly confessed his knowledge of it. Now all these things are quite reconcilable with the probable conduct of a man who was guilty in the full sense; they are not reconcilable with the probable conduct of a man who was in the position which Soutar pretended to be in. The sense of mere guilty knowledge could have been relieved from the first by an anonymous letter giving full particulars, which would not have exposed him to more danger from the supposed perpetrators than the steps he actually took. The desire of mere spiteful vengeance would have been satisfied by a simple information of the fact of the abstraction. But the repeated anonymous letters, and the final confession of knowledge of the place of hiding when the hope of reward was almost dying away, can be explained on no other hypothesis than that of a deliberate attempt at extortion. Soutar might have been wholly silent, in which case his act or the act of the alleged criminals would probably not have been discovered even now. He might have been fully communicative at once, in which case the scandal and the suspense would have been spared to the family. But, speaking as he did and when he did, he must, on every reasonable principle of interpreting human action, be taken to be guilty. The question what accomplices or assistants he may have had is hardly more than one of curiosity. One sufficiently competent witness estimates that two men might have done the deed in three hours, and it may be remembered that expert opinion at the time of the original discovery pronounced the vault to have been extremely insecure. This, however, is hardly an important question. Whether the other persons concerned (if there were such) were employers, accomplices, or tools; whether Soutar is an unlucky understrapper, a too faithful partner, or the chief of a gang denunciation of whom would do himself no good, matters little. He has acted in the matter so that the whole responsibility has been brought home to him, and he bears the consequences.

It seems almost impossible to argue that these consequences are unduly severe. When Lord Craighill remarked that "the case was of its class a case by itself," it may be taken as tolerably certain that he had no such thought of the mere rank of the subject of the outrage, as his critics seem to have supposed. He referred, no doubt, to the cases of body-stealing recorded in the Scotch law books. As to these, there had been a passage of arms between counsel just before his sentence which rather recalls that on the same, or almost the same, subject between Counsellor Pleydell and Glossin in *Guy Mannering*. To the best of our belief, the Judge was perfectly right in assigning to Soutar a bad originality in crime as far as Scotland, and indeed Great Britain, are concerned. In America, as is well known, kidnapping and body-stealing for purposes of extortion have been much more common. There is nothing but the severity of the law to prevent them being equally common in England. Private graves in a situation so sequestered as that of the Dunecht burial-place may not be very common; but, on the other hand, they are by no means rare. The substitution for the most part of interment in cemeteries, which are purposely placed in out-of-the-way sites, for interment in churchyards close to houses and the ways of men, also facilitates the body-snatcher's operations. We have plenty of rich men among us; and our rich men have, it is to be hoped, not a few affectionate relatives whose thoughts of their dead friends are not limited to the desire, attributed by an old "Joe" to an heir, of writing "Requiescat in pace," and not "Resurgam," on the hatchment. In these circumstances a light sentence would have been a premium upon a peculiarly base and disgusting form of crime. No doubt in this case, as in all such cases, it is possible to rake up other sentences on other forms of crime, and to compare them unfavourably. It must indeed be a heaven-born legislator or administrator of the law who should manage to adjust a sliding scale of penalty for every imaginable offence which will commend itself to the sentiments and consciences of everybody. But the general principles which govern the adjustment of punishment are neither recondite nor contestable. They are not calculated with reference to the moral heinousness of the offence, so much as with regard to its noxiousness to society, the strength of the temptation to commit it, the likelihood of its frequency, and other considerations of the same sort. From all such points of view, the deed of which Soutar was found guilty deserved a heavy sentence. Unlike most crimes, it is without a shadow of excuse, coming from momentary passion, desire, or error of judgment. Being possibly very lucrative, it is proportionately tempting, and in the pain, the vague apprehension, and the nervous disturbance which its frequent occurrence would cause it is specially noxious. It is not often that a judge has a chance of checking the rise of a new branch of crime. Lord Craighill had such a chance, and he deserves the thanks of the community for having availed himself of it.

THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT BOARD REPORT.

THE Report of the Local Government Board increases in interest year by year. The relief of the poor, the care of the public health, and the supervision of the authorities concerned with each, are functions which tend to become more important as the popular conception of the duties comprised under them grows more comprehensive. The reader scarcely knows whether he is most pleased at noting the steady progress of good administration

in these several departments, or is surprised that this progress, though steady, should be so slow. Standing by itself, for example, the statement that between 1871 and 1881 the decrease in the cost of outdoor relief has been more than a million sterling is highly satisfactory. But, notwithstanding this, the amount actually spent on outdoor relief in 1881 was upwards of two millions and a half. Things were much worse ten years ago, but they are bad enough still. The statistics for different parts of the country show a remarkable difference in the outlay upon outdoor relief when compared with the whole sum spent. In London only about 26 per cent. of the total relief is given outside the workhouse; in Wales only about 17 per cent. is given in the workhouse. Of the remaining districts, the two worst are the South-Western and the North Midland, while the two best are the South-Eastern and the North-Western. In the South-Eastern district the proportion is probably to be explained by nearness to London, and the consequent preponderance of educated men in the Boards of Guardians, and in the North-Western by the superior business faculty to be found in the great manufacturing towns. The worst feature in the returns of outdoor relief is not, however, the total sum spent, but the smallness of the amount per head together with the method in which it is given. The sum of 2,660,022*l.* was last year divided among 566,479 persons, making the average cost of each outdoor pauper only 4*l.* 13*s.* 11*d.* As this is less than two shillings a week, it is evident that the paupers in receipt of it must have other means of support. The old practice of giving relief in aid of wages is doubtless still common, and no better proof could be desired of the extent to which sound principles of Poor-law administration have still to make their way in the country. Soon after the introduction of the Act of 1834 the Poor-law Commissioners insisted on the advantages of giving outdoor relief in kind rather than in money. They pointed out that while relief in kind might "be considered as the relief itself," since the object of the *bond fide* applicant was the immediate means of sustenance, a gift of money was only the means of obtaining relief, "which means the pauper is under constant temptation to misapply, and in a large proportion of cases is incompetent to apply properly." Relief in money goes, for the most part, to the beer-house in the country and to the gin-shop in the towns. Relief in kind may occasionally be turned to the same uses, but "this misappropriation is necessarily attended with increased trouble, loss, and risk of detection." These obvious considerations were recommended to the notice of Boards of Guardians nearly half a century ago. It seems scarcely credible that in 1882 the Local Government Board should still have to say that "the proportion which relief in kind bears to relief in money at the present day is very small. During the years 1880-81 the relief to outdoor paupers in money was 2,297,781*l.*, but in kind it only amounted to 325,613*l.*—that is to say, for *l.* given in the objectionable shape of money only *1d.* is now administered in kind." The saving of trouble and of immediate cost in the purchase and distribution of food is probably the principal cause why this abuse is still so firmly clung to. Surely it is now time to increase the powers which the Local Government Board possess of bringing Guardians of the Poor to reason.

The intellectual blindness of local authorities gives less cause for wonder than the curious inability of some of them to understand those plain rules of morality which govern the outlay of other people's money. That the rates should only be applied to the specific objects for which they are levied may seem a truism, but in a certain number of instances it is not yet recognized as a truth. Besides a general reference to cases in which fraudulent dealing with the rates is made possible by "want of knowledge or of vigilance on the part of those who are directly accountable for the funds derived from this source," the Report contains some curious examples of charges made in perfect good faith, but in equally perfect ignorance of the principles of public expenditure. It is not strange, perhaps, that a Surveyor of Highways should put into his own pocket the discount he receives upon bills paid out of the highway rate, but it is exceedingly strange that he should be so confident of his right to it as to appeal against a surcharge by the auditors, the ground of his appeal being that he and his predecessors had done the same thing for twenty years, and that no objection had been made to it. That the salary of a mole-catcher should be paid out of the rates and nothing said about it is perhaps natural, but hardly that it should be done in such perfect innocence as to be recorded in an agreement on a shilling stamp and entered on the minutes of a parish meeting. It is still apparently the custom of some local Boards to feed themselves at the cost of the rates, and during the past year an appeal was actually lodged by a local authority against a decision of the auditor disallowing a charge for providing the members, "at frequent intervals during several weeks," with a "substantial repast," including soup, fish, meat, poultry, game, pastry, cheese, salad, and dessert, together with ale, stout, and brandy, "for a considerable number of persons." The most remarkable instance, perhaps, of a disallowed item is "Theatre, 4*s.*" which occurs among the expenses incurred by a deputation sent by a local authority to London. Whether the whole deputation visited the gallery, or sent one of their number to represent them in a more conspicuous part of the house, is not stated. Why, having made up their minds to spend any part of the rates in this way, they did not spend more must be put aside as one of the mysteries of parochial ethics.

Since the 19th of August, 1871, the Local Government Board have allowed urban and rural sanitary authorities to borrow upwards of 24,000,000*l.* The process of charging the rates for a long period of years with the repayment of principal and interest

is so easy that, unless a very strict watch is kept on the proceedings of energetic local authorities, the rates of the future are likely to be mortgaged to an enormous extent. It is satisfactory to know that in dealing with applications for permission to raise loans the Local Government Board "have strictly scrutinized the purposes for which the money is to be borrowed," have satisfied themselves "that the works for which the loans have been required have been necessary and suitable to the locality, and that the estimates have not been excessive," and have usually held an inquiry in the district so as to give "the ratepayers and other persons interested an opportunity of expressing their views in the matter." Where a check of some kind is so much needed, it is unfortunate that any greater freedom should be given. It is no very severe restriction to require that the consent of the Local Government Board shall be required for the raising of a local loan, and there is no obvious reason why this condition should not be universal and imperative. So far, however, is it from being so, that during the last ten years upwards of 33,000,000*l.* have been borrowed by local authorities without the sanction of the Local Government Board. These loans have been raised under powers contained in local Acts, and the Local Government Board are evidently of opinion that to some at least of them they would not have given their consent, at all events in their present form. The reason why so many local authorities prefer to include in their local Acts powers of borrowing money which would be more properly raised under the general law, is the expectation of obtaining a longer term for the repayment of the money; and, in the opinion of the Local Government Board, these exceptionally favourable terms are "to some extent the cause of the rapid increase of late years in the indebtedness of sanitary authorities."

The vaccination returns for the year show, as usual, how largely the agitation against this necessary precaution is the work of a few mischievous fanatics. Wherever the authorities are in earnest, vaccination is general. Where the exceptions are many the authorities are either sluggish or themselves infected with the anti-vaccination craze. In London, for example, more than three-fourths of the entire default is due to the three districts of Camberwell, Lambeth, and Shoreditch. That there is nothing peculiar about the circumstances of these Unions is shown by the fact that while in Shoreditch 12*½* per cent. of the children born remain unvaccinated, in the neighbouring Union of Whitechapel, under substantially the same conditions, only 2*½* per cent. escape vaccination. The difference between the two cases seems to lie in the greater or less promptness with which the vaccination officer makes the personal inquiries which he is bound to make within a certain time, but may make sooner or later at his discretion. There is also an extraordinary discrepancy between the returns from different Unions of the vaccination of children born in the workhouse. In St. Pancras Workhouse, for example, out of 265 children born in 1880, 263 were vaccinated before discharge; whereas in Holborn Workhouse only 24 out of 157 were vaccinated before discharge. It is clear that this and similar differences are the result of the higher or lower standard of compliance with the law which the Guardians and the medical officers prescribe to themselves. Still, it is believed that in London a larger proportion of children have been vaccinated during 1881 than in any previous year. In the country, on the other hand, the proportion compares unfavourably with that for 1880—the default chiefly showing itself in Unions like Leicester and Keighley, each of which is the scene of an active agitation against the law. There may be reasons why the law itself should not be made more severe; but there can be none why in cases of exceptional neglect the sanitary authority should not be dissolved, and, if necessary, reappointed by the Local Government Board. It is better to make an occasional inroad upon local independence, than to allow small-pox to be propagated without let or hindrance.

THE COMING FISHERIES EXHIBITION.

IT is now just about eight months since the Prince of Wales presided at a meeting held "to consider proposals for holding an International Fisheries Exhibition in London next year," and in an opening speech following the reading of the report by the Duke of Richmond as Chairman of the General Committee, gave, with the clearness and terseness which always characterize the Prince's utterances on occasions of the kind, a sketch of the objects and hopes for and with which the scheme for the Exhibition had been set on foot. He referred to the great success of the similar exhibition held at Berlin in 1880, and, pointing to the enormous difference between the population of Berlin and of London, thought that the London exhibition had every chance of being successful in all respects. "The statistics which have been given here," the Prince continued, "with regard to the enormous amount of fish taken and delivered in our great markets are, I may say, considerably under the mark, as I am told, and I believe I am correct in stating that it amounts very nearly to a million tons of fish annually taken in British waters by our fishermen, and that last year nearly 154,000 tons were delivered in Billingsgate Market. The value of the salmon fisheries in England, as some of you may be already aware, amounts to 800,000*l.* a year." The Prince of Wales went on to say that the fisheries had not been neglected in any of the great international exhibitions dating from 1851 downwards; but that this special exhibition would be naturally a fuller and larger development of what had as yet been done; and he added that not only everything directly connected with

fishing, but also everything connected with lifeboats and life-saving apparatus would find an important place in the Exhibition. In a previous part of his speech he had pointed out what it seems especially desirable to dwell upon, that the Committee were "very anxious that foreign countries should co-operate with us." Among other important speeches were those made by the Duke of Edinburgh, Lord Salisbury, and Lord Kimberley, and from these speeches good deal that was interesting was to be learnt. To some of the points thus put forward we may presently recur, but meantime it may be worth while to state what has been done since the meeting of February last.

Naturally one of the first things to be done was to find a suitable place for the Exhibition, and the Sites Committee came to the conclusion that the best place they could acquire was the Horticultural Gardens at South Kensington; and this site has accordingly been retained by arrangement with the Royal Commissioners of the Great Exhibition of 1851 for the purposes of the Exhibition. The answer to the question of what is to be exhibited, which is also an important question, covers so much ground that it is hardly possible to give it as it is set forth in the papers already printed concerning the Exhibition. But under the head of Fishing, subdivided into Sea Fishing and Freshwater Fishing, we find in Class I., Section I., "Gear of every description and of all nations used in trawl, herring, long line, hand line, and every other mode or system of fishing, including all nets, lines, harpoons, tackle, &c. employed in the same"; "oyster dredges, crab, lobster, prawn, &c. [a pregnant &c.], pots, and other appliances for catching fish of this description"; "Fishing Craft of all Nations" (in models); and so on through everything connected with fishing and fishing-vessels, of which it is possible to think, including electric lights, luminous paint, fog-horns, steam and hand capstans, and "other equipment of fishing-vessels" with charts for fishermen. Also we have in the same class and section models of harbours, piers, and so on, life-boats and life-saving apparatus of every description, "appliances and methods for breaking the force of the sea at the entrance of harbours and elsewhere"—this no doubt refers specially to the very interesting and important experiments lately made with oil—"methods of communication from the shore to lightships and fishing fleets by submarine cables, telephone, or other means of signalling," and methods of protecting submarine cables from injury by fishing operations, a matter to which the Committee have done well to give a prominent place. The section devoted to freshwater fishing has an interest which is, from the nature of the case, less wide and penetrating; but the classification is as careful in this department as in the previous one, and has its own attraction for all those who are skilled with bait, fly, or spinning bait, or with "traps, nets, bucks, wheels, and all kinds of apparatus for catching eels, lampreys, &c."

In Class II. we come back to the consideration of more widely human interest, and have to deal, under the heading of "Economic Condition of Fishermen," with their "apparel and personal equipment," with their food and medicine chests, with their dwellings, and with "contracts of partnerships; insurances of life, boats, gear, &c.; benefit societies." That the subjects included in this class deserve the fullest consideration will at once be recognized by all who have mixed at all with deep-sea fishermen, a class of whom the best representatives have many qualities in common with the best Alpine guides. And those whose good fortune it has been to know the best Alpine guides will at once see, better than any explanation can tell them, how much is meant by the comparison. In the first-rate fisherman, as in the first-rate guide, the qualities of courage, endurance, trustworthiness, devotion are prominent. But there are other qualities to which it is less easy to give a name—qualities which make friendship with perfect ease, or, in other words, without the chance of a jarring or indiscreet word; qualities which, it is to be feared, are dying out more and more under the influence of "this so-called nineteenth century." However this may be, and it would be agreeable to think that our view in this matter was pessimistic, it is pleasant to find their due importance given to the matters just touched on. Passing on to Class III., we find that it has the chief heading of "Commercial and Economic." The first sub-heading is "Preparation, Preservation, and Utilization of Fish," and includes for edible purposes models of fish-curing establishments, preparations of fish preserved in various ways, edible products from fish, and antiseptics for preserving fish as food. The purposes "other than edible" contain oils, manures, and other products prepared from fish, methods of preparing these products, sea and fresh-water pearl-shells, mother-of-pearl manufacture, &c., and all kinds of preparations and applications of sponges, corals, pearls, shells, and all parts and products of aquatic animals.

The second sub-title of the "Commercial and Economic" class explains itself in the words "Transport and Sale of Fish"; and these words make its importance and application clear enough. Class IV. is devoted to "Fish Culture," and this again carries with it a sufficient explanation. At the same time, it may be desirable to note that opportunities will here be afforded on a larger scale than has hitherto been feasible for exhibiting models or drawings of fish hatching, breeding, and rearing establishments, with every thing that can appertain to such establishments, as of everything relating to fish farms and fish ladders. "Fish Culture" also includes representations illustrative of the development and progressive growth of fish, of the diseases of fish, with special reference to their origin and cure, of processes for rendering polluted

streams innocuous to fish life, and of all the less immediately practical things which science can suggest as to the well being, in all kinds of circumstances, of aquatic animals. Class V. is devoted to "Natural History (Aquaia)," and in its sub-headings everything seems to have been remembered, down to the claims of "Reptiles, such as tortoises, turtles, terrapins, lizards, serpents, frogs, newts, &c." The inclusion of serpents may perhaps surprise those who have not made any study of natural history or who have not happened to see, what it was our fortune not long ago to see, a viper swimming down a living stream with such extraordinary speed and skill that it was with difficulty caught up and despatched by a group of people, some of whom were mounted. In the Sixth Class of the International Fisheries Exhibition we find ourselves amid the "History and Literature of Fishing, Fishery Laws, Fish Commerce," and this class, it may be imagined, will have a tolerably wide scope, even in its first subdivision of "Ancient Fishing Implements and their Reproduction, &c." The other subdivisions, as to fishery laws of different countries, copies of international treaties, and reports on acclimatization and attempted acclimatizations of fish, deal obviously enough with a large subject. The Seventh Class is headed "Loan Collections," and under this heading we learn that the Committee will be prepared to receive and consider the offer of money prizes for any special exhibits or essays connected with the objects of the Exhibition. A large number of prizes for the exhibits are, it may be here mentioned, already announced.

As to the practical importance and bearing of the Exhibition to be opened next year, we may touch upon some of the points above alluded to in the speeches delivered at the February meeting. How many of us know as to the herring fishery that the number of fish taken year by year is something like 2,633,000,000, exclusive of sprats, pilchards, and whitebait, and that, putting the fish at a halfpenny apiece, the value of the herrings alone taken in one year amounts to about five millions of our money? Again, how many of us know or realize how much harm is done or how much good is avoided by the neglect of the fisheries of Ireland, "which are at the present time almost exclusively conducted by boats coming from the Isle of Man, from Lowestoft, from Cornwall, and also by a large fleet of French vessels"? This we quote from the speech of the Duke of Edinburgh, who went on to say that, "To give an idea of how the developing of these Irish fisheries might with ease be conducted, I would mention that during the year of distress in Ireland, the Canadian Committee gave in one district 200,000 worth of nets, and that year people to whom they were given realized 1,200,000 worth of mackerel." The speaker went on to make certain inferences which, with respect to the particular locality, may be thought too sanguine, as to the probable effect of a better organisation; but the International Fisheries Exhibition is fortunately not concerned with Ireland alone, and the facts brought forward have their value and importance irrespective of particular localities. That the undertaking is one worth thinking of, and one well worth carrying out, will not be doubted, and this fact has, it seems, been recognized by, amongst other important countries, the United States, Sweden, Norway, Holland, Belgium, China, Japan, and Chili. From the United States, especially, much may be expected. The Colonies, again, have responded largely to the invitation extended to them, and it is only to be regretted that certain important European countries have not yet given their adhesion to a scheme which certainly deserves the title of international. It remains to add that the regulations drawn up are eminently sensible and practical, and to wish every success to a project of which the results should have enduring value.

THREATENED STRIKE IN THE COAL AND IRON TRADES.

THERE is a general movement both in the coal and iron trades for an advance in wages. In the North of England district the ironworkers ask for a rise of 7½ per cent., while the masters insist upon a reduction of 7½ per cent. There is thus a difference of 15 per cent., or 3s. in the pound, between the two. It is a very wide and serious difference. Did the masters simply refuse an advance, or did the men simply try to retain their present wages, there would be more hope for a compromise. But when one party demands an advance and the other a reduction, it seems difficult to see how an agreement can be arrived at. In truth, however, the matter is not so threatening as it looks. Wages in that great district have long been regulated by what is called a "sliding scale." An accountant every three months examines the books of the masters, and announces the selling price of iron during the quarter. With this selling price the wages for the next three months vary according to a specified scale, rising or falling with every rise or fall in the selling price. The question was referred to the men whether they would abide by this system of arbitration which has worked so well since its adoption in averting strikes, and their decision was announced at the beginning of last week. Ten thousand men took part in the balloting, and of these 5,841 declared in favour of arbitration, and only 1,320 against it. There was, therefore, a majority of nearly 4½ to 1. Properly, too, it would seem that those who abstained from voting ought to be reckoned with the majority. If they had been really eager in the matter, they would have gone to the poll with the others; and they would have been really eager, if they were discontented with the

system of arbitration, and determined to strike at any cost for a rise of wages. We may assume, therefore, that nine out of ten men engaged in the iron trade in the North of England are in favour of continuing the system of arbitration. In other words, there will be no strike in that great district; and we hope that the spirit of conciliation prevailing in the North of England will also assert itself amongst the other ironworkers. In the coal trade the prospects are not so peaceful. The men ask for a rise of 15 per cent., or 3s. in the pound, and a large number of the masters have offered advances of various rates. In some places, indeed, 10 per cent. has already been accepted; but in the majority of cases compromise has been refused, and the agitation for the full 15 per cent. rise is going on. At various conferences of delegates it has been decided that notices shall be served by the whole trade on the same day, and that, if these notices are allowed to expire without a concession of the rise demanded, then there shall be a general strike in the coal trade throughout England. The workers in the several pits are now being consulted whether they will carry out this arrangement. Yet even here there are symptoms that the determination of the men is not quite so desperate as it is represented to be. In the first place, as we have said, there have already in some instances been compromises arranged; and, in the second place, there is an evident want of confidence between the several districts. Thus the Lancashire miners have decided to take no steps until the Yorkshire miners have committed themselves, on the ground that, when the Lancashiremen took action some time ago, they were left in the lurch by the Yorkshiremen. Further, it is believed that the Trade-Unions have not funds to maintain a great and prolonged strike. And lastly, it is to be borne in mind that notices have in a large number of cases been already served and withdrawn. We may hope, therefore, that the men are not so resolved upon the full 15 per cent. advance as their leaders represent them to be, and that a reasonable compromise may be arranged.

It is impossible for outsiders to judge whether the men's demands are reasonable or not. Only those engaged in the trade can do so; and even they can arrive at a trustworthy opinion only by comparing notes with one another, and eliminating the causes which in individual cases are exceptionally favourable or unfavourable. It seems clear, however, that some rise in wages is justified. Since the middle of August the price of coal in London has risen over 11 per cent.—a very considerable rise in so short a time. And that this rise is not altogether due to a temporary demand appears from the general improvement in trade, and more particularly from the improvement in the iron trade. Coal is the instrument of all manufacture; and when manufacturing is active the demand for coal increases, and therefore the price tends to rise. But the great consumption of coal is in the manufacture of iron; and the iron trade, it is to be borne in mind, has been improving for over three years. The improvement, it is true, has been slow, and the rise of price in the iron trade itself has been little; still the production of iron has been enormously increased, and it is the production which causes the large consumption of coal. Improvement in the iron trade, then, cannot fail to bring about improvement in the coal trade. And there has also, it is to be recollect, been a great consumption in the shipping trade. Already it is reported that the whole vast shipping of this country is employed. There is, then, a largely increased consumption of coal, which is likely to be maintained for some time to come; and a rise in the price of coal is therefore natural. But, with a rise in price, a rise of wages is justified. This reasoning is supported by the offers of the coal-owners, to which we have already referred, to advance wages in perhaps the majority of cases. Of course many of the employers are opposed to all concession. Where there are many minds, there are inevitably differences of opinion. But it is reasonable to conclude that, when the majority of masters are willing to give an advance of wages, the circumstances of the trade warrant them in doing so. No doubt the coal trade is peculiar in this—that it is more disastrous to stop a colliery than to work it even at a slight loss. Owing to the accumulation of foul gas and of water, and to the general deterioration of plant and works, the stoppage of a colliery is one of the most ruinous things that can be done. Therefore coal-owners would concede to their men somewhat more than they can afford rather than drive matters to extremities; but as yet matters are not nearly driven to extremities, and when the employers meet their men at the beginning of a movement with the offer of a rise of wages, it is reasonable to conclude that their circumstances warrant them in doing so. But it does not follow that the men are justified in asking 15 per cent. The very strength of the motives which urge the employers to avoid driving matters to extremities would lead them naturally to offer at once as much as they can well afford. The probability is, therefore, that where 10 per cent. is offered and 15 per cent. asked, the offer of the employers is nearer to what the circumstances of the trade justify than the demand of the men. Besides, in the nature of the case the men cannot know the condition of the trade as well as the employers. We can only hope that the men will act moderately, and will agree to some fair compromise with their employers. The coal trade has for a long time been in a very depressed condition. It is only now beginning to share in the prosperity which other trades have for some time been enjoying, and it would be deplorable if the unreasonableness of the miners were now to check the improvement which has set in. The greater activity in trade is maintained only by the existing lowness of prices, and it is

obvious that, if the men insist upon too great a rise of wages, a rise of prices must take place; and the danger will then be that trade may be checked, and the men may throw themselves back into the old depressed condition.

If the question were simply one of wages, however, we have little doubt that a compromise would easily be arrived at. The leaders of the men know, quite as well as the employers, that the state of trade at present is rather one of slow and uncertain improvement than of great advances "by leaps and bounds"; it is one, in short, which could easily be changed by untoward accidents, and an undue rise of prices would be an untoward accident. We do not think, then, that the leaders of the men are inclined to push matters to extremities merely for a 15 per cent. rise of wages. What they value much more is a reduction of the output. Every one must sympathize with the desire of the colliers for shorter hours of labour. Working in thick darkness and in choking dust, deep under the ground, it is natural that they should wish to shorten as much as possible their subterranean existence. And the good wishes of most people would attend them if they had put their demand in an alternative form. They do not ask, however, for a rise of wages or shorter hours. They ask for both. It is quite obvious that the improvement in the coal trade is not sufficient to warrant an advance of 3s. in the pound in the wages of the men, and at the same time a reduction in the number of hours which the men work. Possibly this exorbitant demand is intended only to sharpen the willingness of the employers to yield the rise of wages. If so, an arrangement may be expected. But, if the men insist upon both demands being complied with, we fear that a strike is inevitable. The men are not singular in their opinion that by combination they can restrict output and force up prices. The ironmasters of the North of England and of Scotland recently entered into an arrangement by which they limited the number of furnaces in blast in the hope of forcing up prices. The Scotch ironmasters lately withdrew from the combination, but the English masters were willing to continue it; and, in fact, among themselves they do still restrict the output. The fallacy then is shared by both masters and men that a trade can combine to force up prices. That it is a fallacy, however, ought to be obvious enough. For a little while prices may be forced up to an abnormal height, as we saw in 1872 and 1873, but as certainly as they are forced up, so certainly will they come down abnormally afterwards. The brief spell of exorbitant prices in 1872 and 1873 was followed by the long depression of 1873-1879. Both masters and men misunderstand the simple theory of supply and demand. Price is regulated by supply and demand, not by supply alone, as they appear to think. And supply and demand both vary. When the supply is large, the demand is likely to be stimulated; and when the supply is small, the demand is likely to fall off. Where the article is one of prime necessity—as, for example, wheat—if there is a failure of the supply, of course prices may be forced up to famine heights. But where the article is not of prime necessity, the demand does not remain constant; it falls off when prices are raised. In 1872 and 1873 there were contracts to be fulfilled under heavy forfeits, and therefore the high prices of those years had to be paid. But when prices rose all round, consumption fell off, and inevitably the vast speculation based upon these abnormal prices collapsed. It will be so again whenever a similar abnormal rise occurs. It would be unfortunate, then, if the colliers have got into their heads the opinion that they can force up prices indefinitely, and have resolved to do so even at the cost of a strike. In that case they are preparing distress and suffering for themselves, to end in the long run in disappointment and disaster.

INTERNATIONAL ELECTRIC EXHIBITION AT MUNICH.

SINCE the middle of last month there has been open at Munich one of the most interesting and perhaps the most valuable of the exhibitions which have yet been held in connexion with electrical industry. But little has been heard about it in this country, and the reasons are not far to seek. This being an international exhibition, due notice was sent to our Foreign Office, with an invitation to the Government to send delegates to act on the Committee. It is hardly necessary to say that, as in the case of the Paris Exhibition, the Government has not taken any notice of this invitation; and, perhaps warned by the pressure which was brought to bear in the case of the French Exhibition by the Society of Arts and the Society of Telegraph Engineers and of Electricians, no knowledge of these communications has been allowed to reach the officials of any of our learned Societies through Government channels. Now in this case almost all the usual arguments against Government interference in international exhibitions must fall to the ground. At Munich there is not a mere display or gigantic advertisement, but every exhibit has to be put up according to the specification of the Committee, so that continuous tests can be taken during the whole time that the Exhibition remains open. No medals will be awarded, but certificates setting forth without comment the result of the tests of their exhibits will be handed to each exhibitor. As the Government are employing electrical apparatus not only in the Post Office Department, but also both in the army and navy, it would surely have been to the advantage of the public that skilled officers from these departments should have been sent to take part in this the only trust-

worthy competition on a large scale which has yet taken place. In saying that the competition and tests at Munich are alone trustworthy, we do not wish to cast any imputation on the impartiality or ability of the members of the jury either at Paris or at the late exhibition at the Crystal Palace; but, as their services were only called in after the exhibits were in place, they were completely in the hands of the exhibitors, so that but few tests could be made, and those for the most part had to be taken hurriedly and under circumstances which make them of comparatively little value. However, the value to the public services of information which may easily be obtained appears not to be ever considered by any Government department; for again the notice of the reassembling of the Paris Congress of Electricians—who last year fixed the units of measurement to be adopted and the nomenclature to be used throughout the world—was sent to the Foreign Office, with the usual result of no notice whatever being taken of it. Those English delegates who have attended this year's meeting of the Congress have availed themselves purely of private information. The subjects for discussion in this session are of the highest importance to the postal telegraph department—namely, earth currents, lightning protection for telegraphic and telephonic lines, and the all-important subject of the redetermination of the Ohm or unit of resistance—the starting-point for all the other units—and its reproduction by a column of mercury. However, in this last case probably the scientific societies will take care to have most of their delegates present in Paris. But in the case of the Munich Exhibition the whole thing has been so little known that, as the official notices were not communicated to the secretaries of the scientific Societies, no action could be taken by them, and probably but few reports will reach England until the publication of the official Report of the Committee, which we hope will be at once translated and put into circulation.

Though only two English exhibits are to be found, yet, as one of them is Mr. Crompton's arc lamp and the other is Mr. Swan's incandescent light, there will be some valuable information for local authorities who may be about to undertake public electric lighting. No doubt the two systems which are at present most likely to be used for domestic lighting are the Swan and the Edison. As Mr. Edison's inventions are as a matter of course exhibited at Munich, we shall now get the results of simultaneous tests of both systems, instead of having to rely on varying reports of tests made under all sorts of different conditions and at different times. The arrangements for the testing are most complete. The testing rooms are provided with almost all the more modern instruments, and one whole gallery is given up to resistances composed of wires stretched freely in the air, in order that they may be as cool and at as uniform a temperature as possible, whilst amongst them are suspended thermometers, which will be read at frequent intervals, so that the results may have the greatest possible accuracy. The whole Committee has been split up into twelve juries, each undertaking the testing of certain groups of the exhibits. Amongst the working members of these juries are to be found most of the leading physicists of South Germany, whose names alone will be a guarantee of the soundness and accuracy of the work done. The serious interest of the Exhibition depends entirely on these tests, which, as we have pointed out, will be of incalculable value to the immediate future of electrical industry. The limited character of the Exhibition, which, roughly speaking, is purely of South German nationality, prevents its having any feature of great novelty. Shuckert of Nuremberg appears to be the principal constructor of dynamo machines for South Germany, and but few other types are shown, almost all of which are machines well known here, though exhibited under strange names. So entirely is this display South German in character, that even the great firm of Siemens is not represented. There are, however, two new things, for which much is claimed by their exhibitors; one is an incandescent lamp, invented by an Italian named Crunto, in which the carbon filament is tubular, a construction which the inventor asserts produces great economy. The other is a form of secondary battery, exhibited by Schulze of Strasburg, in which sulphur is used in combination with lead; this again is supposed to be advantageous, but until the tests are published we can only find that it differs from other forms by exhaling a by no means pleasant perfume whilst being charged. A distinguishing feature of the Munich Exhibition is the public display of electrical work at long distances; for although, on the whole, the telephones and allied apparatus exhibited are far behind those we know so well in this country, yet a line has been arranged so that conversation can be carried on between the Glaspalaste in Munich, where the Exhibition is held, and Oberammergau, a distance of sixty miles. And, again, a water turbine, five kilomètres away, is used to drive a Shuckert dynamo machine, which supplies the current for six Pilsen arc lights. Of course this is no great feat of electrical engineering; but its public exhibition is valuable, as enabling the public to realize that light can be produced a very long way from the source of power without any very extravagant cost for apparatus. M. Deprez has established a gas engine at Micobach, fifty-four kilomètres distant from the Glaspalaste, and by electric transmission of energy succeeds in producing one-half of a horse-power in the building. As we do not yet know what the power of the gas-engine is, it is impossible to say whether this is a good illustration of the economy of the electrical method of transmitting energy for motive-power over long distances. However, to judge by some rather foggy paragraphs in some of the French scientific journals, M. Deprez seems to claim that he has transmitted sixty per cent. of the energy,

though he only uses ordinary telegraphic wire for the line and return wire.

As might be expected in a country where scientific education is so sound and so thoughtful as it is in Germany, there is a very good display at Munich of lecture instruments and diagrams and models for teaching purposes—things much wanted and but seldom found in this country, where, as a rule, teachers and lecturers have to construct such things for themselves, or have them specially made for them at great expense by instrument-makers who too often seem incapable of understanding the simplest instructions and explanations. Closely allied to educational apparatus is the historical collection, and this is particularly interesting. Amongst the exhibits in this class are the original telegraph of Sommering, dating so far back as 1809, and the original telephone of Reis, constructed in 1861. It is curious to see such close approximations to important modern inventions, and even more curious to reflect that our present working instruments are not improvements or developments of the old, but have been re-thought out from first principles. There is one fact about the Munich Exhibition which ought to cheer those gloomy-minded folk who firmly believe that all our trade is leaving us because foreign nations turn out better work at a cheaper rate than we do. This fact is that there is only one engine in the Glaspalaste which can even be called good, and that is a well-designed and well-made semi-portable compound engine by Messrs. Rushton, Proctor, & Co., of Lincoln, a firm which is comparatively little known in England. To sum up the practical part of the competition, we may say that German telegraphy appears to be fairly good, but not up to the English standard. In telephony Germany is far behind England; but in the question of lightning rods and lightning protection generally, the German nation, at all events in the South, is far ahead of us. As to the new industries of lighting and transmission of energy, making allowance for our superior wealth, there is not much to choose between the two countries. Before leaving the practical part, we may mention that phosphor bronze wire for electrical purposes is again exhibited and is again exciting the attention of electricians. The advantages claimed for this material are that its tensile strength is greater than that of iron, whilst its specific resistance is far lower, being indeed but little higher than that of copper.

Artistically this Exhibition has been a great success, and as a beautiful spectacle has been even superior to the late display at Sydenham. This is no doubt due to the fact that an important Society in Munich which corresponds, roughly speaking, to our Society of Arts has undertaken the management of all decorative exhibits. A pretty theatre has been erected, which is lighted sometimes by arc lights and sometimes by incandescent lamps, and on the stage of which exhibitions of tableaux vivants take place at intervals. Another toy again shows the German love of peep-shows. This is a pretty model of an old Norman church, with a kneeling figure of a priest at the altar, lighted up by an arc lamp. The frivolity of this exhibit is quite atoned for by its wonderful beauty. A more practical, but hardly less attractive, exhibit consists of a room of the past, furnished with beautiful old carved oak, and lighted by candles, side by side with which is a room of the present, furnished with great taste and artistic feeling in the modern pseudo-antique style, and lighted by incandescent lamps. A further concession to the honest love of tea-garden and music-hall effect which is so universal in Germany is made by lighting up a large fountain with different-coloured arc lamps, so as to produce an effect like that of a glorified "Wunderfontain," a pretty toy which always delights a German audience.

In conclusion, we may repeat that the whole scientific and technical world will watch with interest for the publication of the Report of the Committee of the Munich Exhibition, and no doubt care will be taken by our learned Societies to have it as widely circulated as possible.

THE CAMBRIDGESHIRE.

IT ought to be far easier to prophesy about the Cambridgeshire than about the Cesarewitch. In the first place, many of the same horses are usually entered for both of these great handicaps; therefore the result of the Cesarewitch itself should throw considerable light on the Cambridgeshire. Then the racing during the five days of the Second October Meeting is always of a very interesting character, and, either directly or indirectly, it exposes the form of many of the horses engaged for the Cambridgeshire. Yet it is a curious fact that while the Cesarewitch has been won twice by the first favourite during the past five years, no first favourite has succeeded in winning the Cambridgeshire in that time. One of the principal causes of the popularity of the Cambridgeshire is the fact that many more horses are suited to a course a little over a mile in length than to a course of two miles and a quarter, like that of the Cesarewitch. This year there were 137 subscriptions to the former, and only 104 to the latter race. The difference in the number of entries for these two handicaps, however, is usually much greater than this. In each of the three preceding years more than twice the number of horses entered for the Cesarewitch were entered for the Cambridgeshire. The actual field for the last-named race, again, is almost always larger than that for the Cesarewitch, as owners of even indifferent horses hope that if their representatives happen to get a very favourable start it may enable them to give better horses the

slip over the Cambridgeshire distance. The consequence of this is that the Cambridgeshire is the prettier of the two races as a spectacle, since the large Cambridgeshire field is generally able to keep pretty well together up to a late period of the race, whereas the smaller field in the Cesarewitch straggles and tails, after its long wearying gallop, before it is within a quarter of a mile of the winning-post. At the same time, it must be admitted that the severe hill in the Cambridgeshire tells terribly upon horses that are weak in their backs or quarters.

One of the earliest favourites for the late Cambridgeshire was Bruce, the winner of the Grand Prix de Paris. Unfortunately he could not stand his preparation, and his forfeit was paid long before the race. Geheimniß was also made a first favourite a couple of days later; and, considering her wonderful speed, it seemed quite possible for her to win when carrying 8 lbs. less than the weight under which Foxhall won last year. Yet she soon disappeared altogether from the betting, to reappear, however, at a long price the week before the race. Another three-year-old was destined to become a very hot favourite. This was Shrewsbury, the colt that had started first favourite for the Cesarewitch. He had run well in that race as far as the Bushes Hill, and he was in the front rank even in the Abingdon Bottom, but his conformation renders him more suited to a course of a moderate length than to one of two miles and a quarter, so there appeared to be good reasons for expecting him to distinguish himself over the one mile and two hundred and forty yards of the Cambridgeshire. In the last race of the Second October Meeting he had run in a manner that inspired his backers with fresh confidence, for, after making the running gaily for a mile and a half in the Newmarket Derby, he had beaten the winner of the St. Leger by three lengths and a half. It was true that he was receiving 10 lbs. independently of sex, and that the state of the atmosphere was peculiarly unsuited to the wind of Dutch Oven; but after all there is nothing better than public form, and Shrewsbury's friends claimed that he had given the best three-year-old of the year a good 10 lb. beating, so they proceeded to argue that his chance for the Cambridgeshire was that of a winner of the St. Leger put in at 6 st. 10 lbs., or at exactly 30 lbs. less than the weight assigned by the rules of the handicap to winners of that race. It was no matter of surprise, therefore, when Shrewsbury went up to 5 to 1 in the Cambridgeshire betting.

It is satisfactory to see an Oaks winner a favourite for the Cambridgeshire. Thebais had run so badly both at Ascot and at Goodwood that she had been handicapped for the Cambridgeshire at 8 st. 8 lbs., or 12 lbs. lower than the winner of the Derby of her own year; but since Goodwood she seemed to have regained her best form. In the Champion Stakes, at the Second October Meeting, she had run a dead heat with Tristan, when meeting him on 7 lbs. worse terms than those on which the two horses were relatively handicapped in the Cambridgeshire. In the Champion Stakes, again, Dutch Oven had been a neck behind Thebais, when receiving 9 lbs. from that mare. But in the Cambridgeshire Thebais was handicapped to give only 2 lbs. to the winners of the Derby and Oaks of this year. On this form, Thebais appeared to be in the Cambridgeshire at about 7 lbs. below her true form, so she was backed at a short price. What Thebais might have done in the Cambridgeshire is destined to remain a mystery; for, after being left in until eleven o'clock on the day appointed for the race, she was scratched, to the bitter disappointment of her numerous backers. Backers have rarely met with a heavier blow before a race, with the single exception, perhaps, of the scratching of Corrie Roy immediately before the Cesarewitch, a year ago. Thebais's own younger sister, St. Marguerite, is a beautiful filly, and, though rather untrustworthy, she has shown fine form at times. On her worst running she had no chance for the Cambridgeshire; but on her best form, in which she beat Shotover and Nellie at even weights in the One Thousand, she certainly had a chance when handicapped at a stone and 2 lbs. below the winner of the Derby. Nellie had also been an uncertain performer, but on her best running she too had apparently a fair hope of success, when carrying 2 lbs. more than St. Marguerite. It might well be said of these two fillies that they were very dangerous animals to back, because they would not always try, and that they were equally dangerous to lay against, because, when in the humour to exert themselves, they were within a few pounds of the best three-year-olds of the season.

Falkirk had run for three years without ever winning a race, having been beaten a dozen times; but as a four-year-old he was much fancied at 6 st. 12 lbs., although he had no claims to favouritism on public form. Another poor public performer was the even more leniently treated four-year-old Hackness, who had, however, more right to popularity, as she had won a couple of races two years ago. She was only to carry 6 st. 4 lbs., and, as she had been running in hunters' races, the handicapper could hardly be blamed for estimating her powers so humbly. Tristan's public running this year has been very good; but he had 9 st. 4 lbs. allotted to him, and his recent running with Nellie did not encourage the idea that he could win under that weight. Vibration is a very powerful three-year-old, and just the make of horse to win over the Cambridgeshire course; but he was heavily weighted at 7 st. 8 lbs., for although he had run well on two or three occasions, he had hardly shown himself to be within a stone of the best three-year-olds of the year. Buchanan, a five-year-old belonging to the owner of Thebais, was weighted at 1 lb. under 8 st. He is a grey horse by Strathconan, with great power in his quarters. His victory over an immense field in last year's Lincolnshire

handicap will not have been forgotten; but, as a rule, he had not been clever at winning races. The three-year-old colt by *See-Saw* out of *Peine de Coeur* had not won any races this season, but as a two-year-old he had won three, including the British Dominion Stakes of 1,310*l.* at Sandown. He was to have 7*st.* 6*lbs.* on his back, which was rather over than under what his three-year-old form entitled him to carry. Scobell had not done much this year to encourage his backers. He had won the Chichester Stakes at Goodwood very easily, but that was no very extraordinary performance. He had also run within a head of *Tristan* at the Second October Meeting when receiving 7*lbs.*, and he was handicapped on exactly the same terms, relatively to *Tristan*, for the Cambridgeshire; but layers had not forgotten that he had won more than 7,000*l.* in stakes last year. *Sachem*, a three-year-old under 7*st.* 1*lb.*, had lost plenty of races, but he had been third for the Derby, besides being placed to good horses on several other occasions; and it was rather an open question whether he was quite 19*lbs.* below the best three-year-old form. *Cameliard* had met with an accident that had interfered with his training, but his defeat of *Victor Emanuel*, at a difference of weight of 2*lbs.* only, seemed to give him a great chance of victory, as he was handicapped 19*lbs.* below *Victor Emanuel* in the Cambridgeshire.

The day appointed for the late Cambridgeshire will be memorable in the annals of that race. The horses were saddled, and went down to the post, but in consequence of a terrific hail and snow-storm, which rendered the horses unmanageable and any view of the race impossible, the Cambridgeshire was postponed until the next day. The following day was almost as fine as the other had been boisterous. The thirty-one competitors were soon off to one of the best starts ever known. After running abreast for a short distance, *Nesscliff* took the lead, and kept it for more than half the course; but before reaching the Red Post, *Hackness*, the second favourite, dashed forward, and was never caught until the winning-post had been passed. *Shrewsbury*, who had started first favourite, was second, three lengths behind *Hackness*, and *Venusta* was third. *Geheimnis* was a good fourth, and her effort to catch *Hackness* was a very grand one. Her performance was about the best in the race, as she was giving 30*lbs.* and a year to the winner, 24*lbs.* to the second, and 35*lbs.* to the third in the race.

It would appear as if no great handicap could take place without some of the obnoxious accompaniments of racing. About a week before the Cambridgeshire some scoundrel sent a forged telegram announcing that *Shrewsbury*, the first favourite, was lame. From 5 to 1 he went down and down in the betting, until as much as 33 to 1 was laid against him. When several thousands had been laid against him at long prices, it was discovered that the evil report was totally unfounded, and up went the horse in the betting until he was again backed at 5 or 6 to 1. No one, we suppose, would offer any defence for such a piece of villainy as this; but there is an opportunity of robbery which is too often afforded—let us hope through negligence only—by owners of racehorses, who, we like to think, would never intentionally encourage fraud. We refer to the practice of leaving horses in a handicap long after their owners have determined not to start them. There were ninety-eight acceptances for the late Cambridgeshire, but only about sixteen forfeits had been paid five days before the race. Of the remaining eighty-two horses a very considerable number must have been scratched by their owners *in petto* long before any notification of the fact was communicated to the public. We should be exceedingly sorry to think that any owner of a horse that was not to start would commission a betting agent to lay against that horse; but in a racing stable the owner is seldom the only man who is aware that his horse will not run, and unprincipled persons cannot always resist the temptation of betting against a horse winning a race for which they know he will not start. Before the late Cambridgeshire a London auctioneer set an admirable example in this respect. His horse was backed at a very short price, when he found that he would not stand training. If he had sent a judicious agent into the betting market, he might have laid against his horse to hundreds, if not thousands, of pounds, but he both acted with perfect honesty in the matter himself, and also prevented any one else from defrauding the public, by scratching his horse immediately.

The year 1882 may well be remembered by racing men for the extraordinary success of mares in the great races; for the Two Thousand, the Derby, the St. Leger, the Cesarewitch, and the Cambridgeshire, which, with the Oaks, may be said to constitute the most celebrated races in the world, have all been won this season by mares.

REVIEWS.

MISS MITFORD'S CORRESPONDENTS.*

MR. L'ESTRANGE has probably been encouraged to try an apparently hazardous experiment by the respectable success of his *Life of Miss Mitford*. She possessed in her time a merited reputation among authors of the second rank, and she was person-

* *The Friendships of Mary Russell Mitford, as recorded in Letters from her Literary Correspondents.* Edited by the Rev. A. G. L'Estrange. London: Hurst & Blackett. 1882.

ally estimable and popular; but she had been partially forgotten when her biographer revived her fading reputation by his record of a not uninteresting life. Miss Mitford's tragedies repose by the side of Joanna Baillie's; her numerous compositions in verse have disappeared; and her tales and criticisms sufficiently fulfilled their purpose when they provided humble means of subsistence for herself and for the worthless spendthrift her father, in whom, with a loyal perversity, she believed to the last. The rural and domestic pictures of "Our Village" still linger in the memories of the older generation, and perhaps from time to time they may attract new readers. It is not without reason that her correspondents frequently add to their other eulogies the remark that her writings are peculiarly English. American critics prove the justice of the observation by mild objections to Miss Mitford's "feudal prejudices," or, in other words, to her unaffected recognition of the social distinctions with which she was especially familiar. The nature of the present book is explained in the somewhat prolix title-page, though a few letters of Miss Mitford's which are now published are perhaps the best in the collection. Mr. L'Estrange has reason for his belief that light is thrown on the characters of eminent persons by the tone and language of their correspondents. The letters of Boswell which are addressed to Johnson have as legitimate a place as his own in the best of biographies. Modern writers and editors have too commonly neglected this branch of external evidence. The Selwyn Correspondence, consisting exclusively of letters to George Selwyn from his friends and acquaintances, is one of the most valuable illustrations of the social life which it incidentally describes. In the present case the only question is whether Miss Mitford was so considerable a person as to require a supplementary biography, and whether her correspondents were sufficiently conspicuous by ability and reputation. The doubts which may be felt will probably be removed by the simple process of reading a book which is in many parts highly attractive. Mr. L'Estrange has perhaps, especially in the early part of the book, preserved an unnecessary number of complimentary letters; but in after life Miss Mitford both increased the number of her correspondents and took interest in a greater variety of subjects. It may be added that a few of the earliest letters, though they have little merit in themselves, were received by Dr. Mitford from one of the most original and most notorious of his contemporaries. It may cause some surprise to learn that in the early part of the century Cobbett and his family were on visiting terms with the Mitford family, who then belonged to the class of country gentlemen. His acquaintance with Dr. Mitford was founded on their common taste for coursing, and it was cemented by similarity of political opinions, for Dr. Mitford, without a spark of Cobbett's genius, was an almost equally violent Radical. One or two of Cobbett's letters which are now published, though highly characteristic, would scarcely coincide with the professions of modern Radicalism. In one of them he describes the facilities which his farm affords for excluding trespassers. "Here I will, if I live, have a stock of hares and pheasants." The Lord Clanricarde of the time, who had property in the neighbourhood, strictly preserved his game; and when Cobbett heard of his death, "There," said I, "expired the hares of that country." A clergyman named Poulter, succeeding to the depuration of the manor, told Cobbett that thenceforth the gentlemen and farmers of the neighbourhood should be at liberty to sport on the land. "Oh, d—d Levite, thought I to myself, so you would fain persuade me that I shall have better sport when the farmers have killed the hares, and you have stuffed your hogfish parson's [stomach] with them than when they were preserved, and the whole neighbourhood was stocked with them by my Lord Clanricarde. . . . Oh, d—d prebendary, thy maw will now be crammed, and sportsmen may hunger and thirst over the barren downs. What a base dog to curry favour with the rascally curmudgesons of farmers by these means." Those who appreciate Cobbett's humour will not fail to sympathize with his vehement selfishness; and, after all, it is true that game must be preserved, if it is not to be exterminated.

Many of Miss Mitford's earlier correspondents were obscure; and the compliments which they pay her after the fashion of the day are not a little monotonous. Sir William Elford, a literary amateur, is known to posterity only as an elderly gentleman who carried on a mild epistolary flirtation with the young authoress. S. J. Pratt was seventy years ago Poet Laureate; and some feeble prose pastorals which he wrote under the title of "The Gleaner" may be found here and there in old bookcases which were then stocked, and which have never since been disturbed. A Mr. Davenport and a Mr. Madocks are still more utterly unknown to fame; but in the second half of the first volume more familiar forms begin to emerge. Macready and Young negotiated as to the performance of Miss Mitford's tragedies; Miss Strickland descended to intercourse with a less ambitious writer than herself; and Miss Martineau acknowledged Miss Mitford's literary pretensions. Miss Sedgwick, an amiable American writer who is remembered by her friendships rather than by her works, wrote graceful and affectionate letters to a correspondent whom she had never seen. On one occasion she firmly and gently protests against the description of American manners which first created the reputation of Mrs. Trollope, who was also a friend and correspondent of Miss Mitford's. Sergeant Talfourd, as a Berkshire neighbour, had a claim on Miss Mitford's good will which was confirmed by personal liking and by a somewhat overstrained admiration of his pretty and wordy tragedies. Minor poets and prose-writers, combined in local literary circles, always incur the harmless ridicule

which attaches to reciprocal admiration. Miss Mitford herself was not undeserving of the praise which was heaped upon her with a certain confusion between moral and intellectual qualities. Her scenes of rural life were habitually extolled for sentimental reasons as well as on critical grounds. It is not worth while to disentangle her descriptive gifts from the simple tastes and natural sympathies which contributed to her literary success. It may be mentioned, to the credit of her own critical judgment, that she severely condemned the utilitarian theory that imaginative works should be written with a purpose. As she truly said, the greatest writers, Shakspere, Chaucer, Scott, and Miss Austen, were content to reproduce life and character without troubling themselves about the lessons which they might teach. The trick of moralizing was one of the defects which caused her to dislike the writings of Dickens, whom she justly charged with an inveterate habit of cant. His humour was perhaps too much associated with animal spirits to be appreciated by a delicate and invalid woman. With Carlyle Miss Mitford had no personal acquaintance, and his writings, as might be expected, puzzled and repelled her. She reports at second-hand, not without indignation, a highly characteristic comment on Washington which had been with doubtful courtesy addressed to an American visitor. "Your great man George," who, as Miss Mitford truly remarks, was never called by his Christian name before, "was a monstrous bore, and wants taking down a few hundred pegs." "Really, Mr. Carlyle," said the American, unprepared for so startling a piece of iconoclasm, "you are the last man in the world from whom I should have expected such an observation. Look at your own book on Cromwell. What was Washington but Cromwell without his personal ambition and without his fanaticism?" "Eh, sir," answered Carlyle, "George had neither ambition nor religion, nor any good quality under the sun. George was just Oliver with all the juice squeezed out." "I wish," proceeds Miss Mitford, "you had heard Mr. Fields tell this story. I have known many brilliant talkers, but never any one that approached him." If she had known and understood Carlyle, it is no disparagement to Mr. Fields to say that she would have acquired a new standard of brilliancy. In the short conversation which is quoted, Carlyle, whom Miss Mitford intends to ridicule, has the best of the contest. If he could have made the same remark to Hamilton, he would perhaps have found a hearer like-minded with himself. Although Miss Mitford was through life surrounded by second-rate writers, she was sometimes acute in discerning the hollowness or the exaggeration of popular eulogy. She tells in one of her letters a curious little story of a granddaughter of Leigh Hunt, who had once taken a country walk with Miss Mitford. "She was most astonished and puzzled by an object the most natural and most familiar. She had never seen a plough. And this was the constant associate, the favourite grandchild, of the lover of nature. This is what prevents his being a poet, not his being ignorant of the commonest rural objects, but his affecting to be familiar with them; in a word, his want of truth." Her judgment on Longfellow was not perverted by her intimacy with some of his friends, and by exchange of civilities with himself. "Longfellow has beautiful bits, but his prose is trash; and I confess that I think he owes his success here quite as much to his faults, his obscurity, his mysticism, and his little dash of cant, as to his merits."

Not the least pleasant passages in the collection are casual notices of passing acquaintances or strangers, who would sometimes have been surprised at her judgment of their merits. Of Tom Taylor she says, "I suppose there is not in English literature a young man so truly admirable in mind and conduct." Of a younger contemporary of Tom Taylor, who has since become better known, she formed on insufficient grounds a less favourable judgment. Miss Mitford had, perhaps under the influence of a woman of higher genius than her own, become an enthusiastic devotee of Napoleon III. She was consequently indignant when "certain letters signed 'An Englishman, abusing my dear Emperor,' were published in the *Times*." These letters had a tone of authority which might have become not merely a judge or a bishop, but a cardinal or Lord Chancellor. Well, they were written by a lad called Vernon Harcourt, whom our lad here talks of as his junior. I am not sure that he was not his fag at Eton. I cannot tell you how much this has amused me. The letters were inflated and bombastic enough for Tom Thumb, but there was an air of grandeur about them which must have taken in the *Times*. What a fool the lad was not to keep his own secrets." The lad, if such a designation may now without irreverence be retrospectively applied to a Secretary of State, kept his own secrets so far as to furnish Miss Mitford with an opportunity of indulging in several inaccuracies. His undergraduate career was passed not at Oxford but at Cambridge, and he was never at Eton. It also happened that he had nothing to do with the letters of "An Englishman" which were attributed to the late John George Phillimore, Q.C., at one time member for Leominster. It is true that on another occasion the brilliant young pamphleteer used the not uncommon signature of "An Englishman," but it was not against Miss Mitford's dear Emperor that his indignation was then directed.

The strongest attachment which Miss Mitford formed to any one except her father seems to have been inspired by Miss Barrett, afterwards Mrs. Browning. The genuine admiration which she felt for Miss Barrett's poetical genius proved that her taste had not been destroyed by the lifelong habit of exchanging compliments with the minor writers of her time. Her affection for a

friend whom she had known in her own later years appears, from Miss Barrett's letters, to have been warmly returned. The younger lady was probably responsible for the whimsical enthusiasm which both professed for Louis Napoleon. In the early part of their intercourse they supposed themselves to be united by a common Liberalism, though Miss Barrett inclined to sentimental Republicanism, while Miss Mitford only called herself a Radical in imitation of her father. When Louis Napoleon established absolute government in France, Miss Barrett regarded him with an admiration which afterwards deepened into fanaticism for the liberator of Italy. Miss Mitford would probably have embraced even more paradoxical sentiments to prove her devotion to her friend. It may have been pleasant to her to find that the first English poetess was thoroughly feminine in her politics. It was after Miss Mitford's death that Mrs. Browning composed the strange doggerel which ends with "Emperor, evermore." It is not at all necessary that a woman of high genius and noble character should be judicious and temperate in the expression of political opinion.

THE EARLY DAYS OF AUSTRALIA.*

THE transformation of a penal settlement into a prosperous and virtuous colony must always have a certain interest, as the author tells us in the first lines of his preface, to many more than Australian settlers or the Australian born. Mr. Bonwick to a personal experience of Australian possessions joins a minute acquaintance with colonial records, and he has so arranged and digested his ample materials as to give us a graphic and connected account of a generation which it is difficult to conceive as only separated from our own by one century. He has contrived to avoid the snares of perpetually drawing contrasts and pointing morals. He can make allowance for the extraordinary circumstances in which military officers, with no knowledge of civil affairs and no views on trade, industry, and colonization, were called on to rule a society mainly composed of men who had defied and broken the law. And when he does draw attention to the ebullitions of the irrepressible patriot and the quarrelsome settler, he by no means holds them up to admiration as prophets and reformers far too good for their age. The selection of Botany Bay, so called from the variety and extent of its botanical specimens, as a clearing-house for English crime and scoundrelism, is due to the independence of our American Colonies. When the gaols in England were crammed and the plantations across the Atlantic were no longer available for the exportation of our criminals, it was not unnatural for the Government of the day to fix on New South Wales, as in distance, climate, and the variety of its productions, presenting every requisite for the reception, treatment, and reform of the criminal class. The choice of sea-captains and majors, invested with something like despotic authority, as Heads of the Settlement was inevitable. But we cannot find any excuse for the neglect of the Home Government to furnish the settlers with a proper amount of decent food. A plentiful supply of wood and water in Sydney Cove, and florid accounts of meadows and pastures, seem to have led the authorities to think that, after one consignment of live stock and provisions, the settlers would be able to shift for themselves. A season or two was sufficient to disenchant the most serene and hopeful of officials. Ships took eight and ten months to reach the antipodes. On arrival the stores, never very plentiful, were found to be damaged. The half-starved inhabitants eked out their rations by the fortunate arrival of sea birds, and, from sheer physical weakness, were unable to till the ground properly and raise crops for their subsistence. Live stock intended for propagation was killed to keep men alive. Rice was imported from China, and meanwhile men, women, and children were put on half rations, as if they had been passengers on ships becalmed for weeks under the line. The voyage out was so managed as to kill a good many criminals, and to predispose the rest to disease and death on landing. The Ministry of the day relieved themselves of all responsibility by contracting for the transport of convicts at so much a head. The horrible extracts from official papers on this part of the subject, quoted by Mr. Bonwick, read like an account of the African slave trade and the middle passage. From want of proper food, air, cleanliness, and exercise, a large proportion of the convicts died on the voyage, and others only reached Port Jackson to find their graves there. It is not too much to say that for the first twenty years of its existence, or between 1787 and 1807, the colonists, whether convict or free, had barely enough to keep body and soul together, and only just managed to exist.

But inadequate supplies were not the only trials with which the first governors had to contend. Transported pickpockets, not being ruffians, gave comparatively little trouble and settled down into peaceful citizens. But United Irishmen, who had shared in the Rebellion of 1798, behaved in a manner which recent events in Ireland can enable everybody to understand. There were several antipodean risings dignified with the name of rebellions; martial law was proclaimed; general orders were issued; loyal associations were formed to support authority; and the most culpable offenders were punished by hanging or the lash. The author enumerates the services and describes the characters of the first three Governors, Captain Philip, Captain Hunter, and Captain

* *First Twenty Years of Australia: a History founded on Official Documents.* By James Bonwick, F.R.G.S., Author of "The Last of the Tasmanians," &c. London: Sampson Low & Co. Melbourne and Sydney: George Robertson. 1882.

King, all of the Royal Navy; and we are not disposed to judge their action by the severe canons applicable to the present age of special correspondents and Parliamentary exposure. But who, we may ask, was responsible for the selection of Captain Bligh of the *Bounty* as ruler of a settlement where tact, conciliation, and firmness were specially required? We are not in the least surprised to read that a collision was speedily brought about between Captain Bligh and a notable Mr. McArthur who figures prominently in these early records. The officers and men of the New South Wales corps rose in a body, deposed the Governor, and set up a certain Major Johnstone in his place. Of course the revolt ended by the vindication of lawful authority. Major Johnstone was cashiered; the New South Wales corps ceased to be a local corps, and was transformed into the 103rd Regiment of the line. Mr. McArthur, we should state, once held a commission in the army, but he had given up his profession in order to become a free and independent settler. He seems to have been one of those men who, with considerable energy and force of character, take delight in setting rulers at defiance, and yet manage to keep on the safe side of the law. Another colonial notability was the Rev. Samuel Marsden, originally a blacksmith at Sheffield. Possibly, had he remained in England, he might have oscillated between the muscular hunting parson of the old school and the Radical and Dissenter. In a new country he drew the King's pay as a colonial chaplain, supported the Governors, preached sermons, sat on the Bench as magistrate, administered severe discipline to delinquents and malingerers, and was active in promoting the breed of sheep. Such men as Marsden and McArthur, like the fearless and outspoken Interloper in India under the early government of the Company, may be sources of annoyance and disquietude to Lieutenant-Governors and magistrates. But they have the clearness of sight to detect and the determination to expose abuses; and there is more real progress when such men appear on the scene.

The advantages of an importation of unspotted and unconvicted settlers were seen from the first, and steps were taken to induce men of means and respectability to reside in the colony. Grants of land of sixty acres were made to marines and discharged sailors in Norfolk Island. The grantees were to pay a quit-rent, were to be maintained from the public stores with food and clothing, and were to have huts erected for them. To convicts whose time had expired were allotted smaller grants, free of rents and taxes, and such men were encouraged to serve as helpers to the free settlers. But somehow no success attended agriculture or sheep and cattle farming at first. The seed put into the ground was worthless. The sites were ill chosen. Manure was not available. The rainfall was scanty, and the wheat-fields along the Hawkesbury River were laid flat by a hail-storm, described as a "shower of ice"; while other districts suffered from bush fires, or were plundered by the aborigines. Occasionally all arrears of rainfall, as at the present day, were suddenly paid off in violent floods which drowned all the swine. Frenchmen sent out to teach the colonists to grow grapes and make wine found their first ventures spoilt by ignorance and bad management. Cattle-farming fared no better than the cultivation of wheat and maize. A bull and five cows took to the jungle in 1783, became historical, and were not seen again till 1794, when they were tracked in the neighbourhood of Paramatta. The original number had by this date swelled into a herd of sixty, headed by a furious bull that charged the exploring party, and was at once shot down. This herd was subsequently known as "the Government herd," and stringent orders were passed for its protection. These and other measures were so far successful that in 1804 the Government owned more than two thousand head of cattle, composed of bulls, oxen, cows, and calves, and some thirteen hundred head of sheep. The breed of the latter seems to have been improved by the importation of the Spanish variety from the Cape of Good Hope, and leases of grazing lands were granted in 1804, in which the author discerns the first official recognition of the Colonial squatter. "Tante molis erat" to transform a penal settlement possessed of a few swine and stock barely sufficient to keep the residents alive, into a colony that now reckons its sheep at thirty millions.

The progress of the town was not much more rapid than that of the country. Sydney Cove was for commercial purposes admirably chosen, and indeed Governor Phillip and his advisers would have been liable to the classical censure passed on those who neglected to fix on Byzantium, had he missed his opportunity. But the supply of water was deficient, and was often defiled by careless soldiers. The soil was somewhat sterile. A town sprang up of huts and barracks without any method or plan, and we can readily believe that "meanness and fragility of structure distinguished primitive Sydney." Trade got on feebly under monopolies and restrictions. Military settlers controlled and commanded the market, and nominated delegates who bought whole cargoes imported by merchant-vessels and retailed them to the colonists at an enormous profit. Sugar landed at 8d. was charged 3s. Tea at 10s. a lb. was sold for sums varying from 2d. 10s. to 7d. 10s., and hats worth 2s. for 20s. There was a functionary termed the "Vendu Master," as there used to be in the old days at Madras and Calcutta, who disposed of these and other articles to a starving and fretful community. There was no end to the appeals to the Governor, to letters to the Secretary of State, and to the issue of public orders before the combination was defeated and trade could be free. It is not surprising that, while the pressure lasted, many irregular promissory notes went up and down in the market, and Government had to prescribe a regular form for this undesirable currency. English money was scarce, and dollars usurped the

place of sovereigns, while the Indian rupee actually reached the fabulous exchange of half-a-crown. Boat-building was carried on under strict regulations as to size, and as early as 1791 merchants sent ships from Sydney to catch whales in the south, or, starting from Europe, combined this enterprise with the transport of convicts to Sydney. Mr. Bonwick seems somewhat perplexed by a Government order prohibiting any intercourse between "the colony and the Honourable East India Company's territories." The simple explanation, we take it, is that the Government of Bengal had quite enough to do in licensing, looking after, and occasionally deporting its own independent Englishman, who was above all local laws, and for any serious crime committed by him beyond the precincts of the Mahratta ditch, three hundred miles up the country, could only be tried before a sympathizing Cossitola jury in the old Supreme Court of Calcutta. Neither Lord Cornwallis nor Lord Wellesley was anxious to add to local difficulties by promoting intercourse with a colony composed of convicts and ex-officials converted into traders. Licences to carry on business were indispensable at Sydney, and no man could leave the colony without advertising his intention in the Gazette. Due care was given to the preservation of forests and minerals, and the growth of hemp and flax was encouraged in general way. A windmill was finished in 1797; but the workmen stole the sails, and no local workman could supply the loss. That postage on letters home should be enormous is not surprising. Though the colonists very soon founded "a Settlers' and a Landholders' Society" for their own protection, it must not be imagined that they were superior to the political economy of the day. The Society, under the sanction of the Government, fixed the hours and remuneration of work, and ruled that a fat goose was to be sold for 5s., and that a labourer was to get 12s. 6d. for felling an acre of wood. The whole list of prices for every kind of article, from moist sugar to muslin and calicoes, is curious and instructive. The sale of spirituous liquors, which was slight and casual when the inhabitants lacked flour and meat, flourished after ten years, and led naturally to gambling, robbery, and murder. Rum, says the author pithily, was the currency of the period and bought everything. Sir W. Lawson would be glad to know that Governor Hunter on one occasion refused to allow "the poisonous article" to be landed, and that the Ministry at home approved of an order prohibiting the civil and military officers from selling liquor to the convicts and settlers. But, if spirits could not be landed, they could be made in the colony, and the local Government fulminated many ineffective orders against private distilleries. Yet threats of fine and imprisonment were vain, and licences had to be granted, it was urged, to reduce the consumption and to promote morality, but in part also to add to the revenue. Breweries were patronized in the hope that the settlers would prefer wholesome beer to fiery brandy. The statistics of the population show that, in 1791, there were about three thousand male and female convicts then in bondage. The free or freed portion of the community amounted to rather more than four hundred. These figures, as we interpret them, include Sydney and Norfolk Island. Eighteen years afterwards the population of New South Wales alone, or the "Main," as it was called, had increased to only 7,562, and of these 999 were free settlers and landowners.

We hear very little of the aborigines in these times. One eminent man of the woods, named Bennalong, was introduced to the Governor, taken to England, and, what is more wonderful, brought back again to his native land. The tribes near Port Jackson were decimated by pestilence, which we must believe, in spite of a disclaimer in the narrative, was small-pox, introduced by the white man. Ill treatment by the strong settler who stole children and carried away young women provoked reprisals, and there are some shocking stories about stabbing and spearing. It is necessary to state that the authorities did all in their power to prevent cruelty and rapacity, and to protect the weaker in these unequal contests. Convicts attracted much more attention, as may easily be conceived, than miserable blacks. The labour exacted from them was not excessive, and occasionally task work was imposed, any neglect entailing the punishment of whipping. Those who were masters of any handicraft disguised their skill in the hope of getting lucrative private employment; and, naturally, according to the character of the employer, they were either treated worse than slaves or enjoyed practical freedom and acquired a competence. Much indulgence was shown to political offenders. To become a bushranger was then termed "taking to the woods," and the most lawless and irreclaimable characters soon adopted this profession, though we are informed that in New South Wales it never flourished as it did in Van Diemen's Land. Our review would be incomplete without some notice of the colonial press. The first newspaper, the *Sydney Gazette*, was published in 1803, and we regret to add that the issue was imperilled not by lack of news, nor by despotic censorship, or any other controlling cause, but by sheer want of the material, paper. In vain did the editor advertise, promise liberal terms to subscribers who would contribute foolscap and letter paper, and fill the broadsheet with type to its very edge. A study of Mr. Bonwick's facts and figures leads to the conclusion that the first twenty years of Australian history were made up of a continued struggle for existence against narrow-mindedness, neglect of ordinary precautions, short commons, and forgetfulness of the universal laws which regulate demand and supply. But those who linger over these entertaining records will do well to remember Lord Macaulay's warning, and not think themselves greater men than Columbus

because he went to his grave ignorant that there was such a country as New Holland, nor must they draw a parallel between Governors Phillip and Hunter, and Sir William Denison or Sir George Grey.

ENGLISH POLITICAL LEADERS—WILLIAM PITT.*

THE spirit in which Mr. Lewis Sergeant has undertaken to tell the story of the life and achievements of the younger Pitt may partly be judged from some phrases in his peroration. He speaks of "the more manly, the more wholesome, ideas of the present generation on the subject of war and its alternatives"; he remarks that "through the clear atmosphere of afterthought the triumphs of the Napoleonic wars seem less valuable, and the thousand millions that they cost us loom more gigantic." We shall not lay much stress on the unfortunate choice of words in the phrase "looming" through a clear atmosphere. But the general sentiment is important as marking Mr. Sergeant's political standpoint very definitely. It is the modern Radical standpoint, and Mr. Sergeant clings to it so closely that he actually crosses swords with Mr. John Morley—surely an orthodox professor of the same views—on a remark of Burke's. Mr. Sergeant, by the way, is desperately angry with Burke; he calls him "a rhetorician and little else." It is amusing to find how constantly the doctrinaires of this form of political creed denounce as rhetoricians the persons who decline to swallow formulas whole, and exercise upon them the dissolvent force not of rhetoric but of logic.

This is something of a digression, though, as helping to define our author's attitude—always an important point—it is hardly an impertinent one. It may be thought that in Mr. Sergeant the deadly enemy of Radical and revolutionary principles, the Pilot that weathered the Storm, would have small chance of fair treatment. But, in the first place, Mr. Sergeant, except where his formulas constrict him, appears to be a very fair-minded man; and in the second place it must be remembered that in Pitt's curious life the second half was in almost direct apparent contradiction to the first. If Pitt had died somewhere about 1792 he would have been inscribed in the calendars of Liberal hagiology as a Reformer, a Free-trader, an emancipator of the Roman Catholics, a defender of oppressed nationalities, an economist, a peace politician, an actual partisan of the Revolution itself. No one but an idiot, or a partisan so rabid that he can hardly lay claim to sanity, attributes the change in his policy on all these points to interested motives, to political subservience, or to anything of the kind. Thus the admirers of the first part of his career, though they may gently sigh over the second, can only set it down to misfortune, not to fault.

Mr. Sergeant has given a careful and fairly lucid account of Pitt's political life, but he has displayed little biographical talent (and Pitt's personal idiosyncrasy is curious enough to require the exercise of this), and has not even attempted to construct a coherent scheme of his hero's political character. The two propositions which seem to explain Pitt's course are these—that he was intensely patriotic; and that he had, with all his admirable grasp of the secondary principles of politics, no general political theory. His fervid patriotism, in which his more demonstrative father hardly equalled him, and which is embodied in the famous dying speech—one of the few dying speeches which seem absolutely authenticated—distinguishes him from a politician to whom his second characteristic approximates him, the present Prime Minister of England. It is impossible to conceive Pitt ever talking about "this small little island," or adopting Mr. Gladstone's policy of 1876. Nor has Mr. Gladstone ever had that excuse for the apparent change in his political ideas which was supplied to Pitt by the French Revolution. But in neither of them is it easy to discern any consciousness of the fundamental difference between the two main theories of politics, or any conscious adoption of one rather than the other. Mr. Gladstone sees all things in Mr. Gladstone; Pitt saw all things in England; and this makes a vast difference between them. But in their several ways they were both opportunists; and it cost Pitt probably no more to resist and suppress the Reform he had formerly favoured than it did Mr. Gladstone to destroy the Irish Church which he had formerly extolled and defended. The difference of motive is everything, the difference of procedure small.

We are not, however, to look to Mr. Sergeant for any considerations of this kind, or, indeed, for any general considerations at all. His description of Pitt at his entrance into politics will serve fairly as a specimen of his style:—

The arena of politics into which the young but highly trained athlete had descended, and where in less than three years from his entrance he figured as the most conspicuous gladiator of all, had been familiar to him from a boy. He was born and bred for Parliament. To follow in his father's steps had been his dream and aim in life. He had frequented the gallery before he had a right to the floor, and thus the face, the attitudes, the talent, and the tone of every prominent member on either side of the House were for him as the contents of a well-thumbed book. He had watched the fray from his vantage-ground, eager to take a part in it; he had criticized the strategy of the combatants, distributed his praise and blame, overthrown every weak argument to his own satisfaction—occasionally also to the conviction of the debaters with whom he was privately brought in contact, and who marvelled at the power and wisdom concealed beneath that boyish exterior.

* English Political Leaders—William Pitt. By Lewis Sergeant. London: W. Isbister, Limited. 1882.

The criticism of contemporary statesmen which follows is less elaborate than this, and sometimes not very happy. We have seen that Mr. Sergeant can make no discovery about Burke, except that he was a rhetorician, which is not a very novel one, though it has perhaps as much novelty as accuracy. Of North he says that "his chief crime seems to have been weakness." "Crime" is a large word, and we should rather have said that the chief fault of North was the strength with which he clung to an impossible conception of government—the conception which united representative institutions and Ministerial responsibility with a large exercise of discretionary interference on the part of the Sovereign. In speaking of Sheridan Mr. Sergeant quotes with approbation the "shrewd thrust" delivered by Pitt in 1804 at Sheridan's "blazing face," which, says Mr. Sergeant, "everybody knew to blaze by reason of Madeira." It is not altogether clear how an excessive drinker of port can deliver very shrewd thrust by alluding to the weaknesses of an excessive drinker of Madeira.

The tracing of the curious chain of resemblances between Pitt and Mr. Gladstone is the most interesting occupation of the reader of Mr. Sergeant's book; all the more so that, as has been said, the writer seems to have had no idea of them. Pitt's dwelling on the pain with which he imposed new taxes suggests Mr. Gladstone's expressions about new Coercion Bills, and perhaps may come to have a yet closer analogue in the later statesman's life. Both of them were pluralists in the way of Cabinet offices, and both, though by different means, played off the constituencies against the House of Commons. Even in minor details there is a likeness. When Lord Thurlow made that celebrated and affecting appeal to the Deity which was the cause of two admirable witticisms from Wilkes and Burke, Pitt "rushed out of the House, exclaiming, 'What a rascal!'" Horror would also have been Mr. Gladstone's note, while it is not difficult to imagine the very different view of the transaction which Bolingbroke or Walpole, Lord Palmerston or Lord Beaconsfield, would have taken. In nothing recorded of the younger Pitt do we remember any sign of humour or appreciation of humour, and in this case his mantle (or the absence of one) must be said to have descended fully on the shoulders of his present successor in the joint offices of First Lord of the Treasury and Chancellor of the Exchequer. The sentiment that "the Government ought not to be afraid of incurring the imputation of weakness by yielding in reasonable points" is of course an undeniable one in the abstract, but the expression of it helps to bring out the lines of resemblance between two histories and two characters which are exceptionally alike in some points, different as they are in others.

One naturally turns with some interest to the chapter on "Pitt and Ireland." Pitt was not directly responsible for that concession of Home Rule which turned out so disastrously, and he was responsible for its inevitable recall in 1800. Mr. Sergeant is, of course, a justice-to-Ireland man, but he admits that the coercion which Pitt had to apply freely long before the Union was practically unavoidable. He makes the following remark, "The situation is very much what we have seen it in our own day, when English Ministers, with every disposition and desire to carry large measures of reform, have been met by the counteraction of popular animosities, and have been constrained by the force of opinion in the middle and upper classes, aided by a section of the lower classes, to postpone everything else to the maintenance of order." If this rather mysterious innuendo means anything, it means that, though order may be heaven's first law, it certainly is not Mr. Sergeant's. In the actual account of what followed, Mr. Sergeant commits himself to some singular historical statements. To say that the expedition of Hoche was "hopeless from the beginning," and that "if it had not been defeated by the weather it would have had no chance on dry land," is to say what is absolutely inconsistent with historical and military probability, with the opinions of those contemporaries who were best qualified to judge, and with the subsequent experience of Humbert's detachment. If fifteen thousand French troops under such a general as Hoche had landed, it may be certain enough that they would have been conquered in the end, but it would only have been after at least three provinces of Ireland had been in their hands for some time. Passing from things military to things political, we meet Mr. Sergeant's statement that "it can scarcely be maintained, though the contention is sometimes hazarded, that the experiment of an Irish Parliament had been made and failed," with a direct opposition. It was made, and it did fail. Independently of the legislative incapacity displayed by the Parliament itself, the reluctance shown by it to combine in any scheme for the general good of the Empire shows the real danger of Home Rule once and for all.

We cannot follow Mr. Sergeant through his account of Pitt's policy subsequently to the French Revolution. He has evidently taken great pains to be moderate and fair in dealing with it, and has succeeded in no small degree. But, perhaps because of his want of sympathy with military operations, he has not pointed out that Pitt, except for his indomitable spirit, was a bad War Minister, as, for the matter of that, his father was too. He had inherited the mischievous and costly idea of attempting feebble expeditions which did the enemy no harm and England no good. He had not, like his father, the luck to put his finger on one general; and, with the exception of Abercrombie's and Hutchinson's Egyptian work, it is hardly possible to think of a single business (out of India) which threw lustre on the English arms by land between 1792 and 1805. Some of this may have been simply due to bad fortune and other circumstances not under the Minister's

control, but hardly the whole of it. The truth probably is that Pitt never really liked war, and never bent to its consideration and arrangement the wonderful administrative powers which he had.

TREHERNE'S TEMPTATION.*

WHEN one gentleman has the bad luck to cause the death of another by misadventure, he confesses it, and takes the consequences. This is natural and obvious conduct; and if lady novelists did but know as much, we might be spared one of the cheapest and commonest of familiar plots. Though the name "Alaric Carr" is masculine enough, we cannot but believe that the author who has adopted it is a woman. It would be scarcely possible for a man, however little he knew of the world, to make his hero an involuntary homicide who chooses to keep his ugly secret. This is the position of Jasper Treherne, the hero of *Treherne's Temptation*, which we fear we must call a very poor novel indeed. The writer is by no means stupid, and has a very fair taste in literature. Heine and Shakespeare are familiar to him (or more probably to her), and one of her characters shows a proper appreciation of *Richard Feverel*. "It is brimful of wisdom and humour, and there is not a dull line in it from beginning to end—no living novelist has written anything that deserves to be named in the same century with it." Unfortunately, the author of *Treherne's Temptation* knows what is right, but only so; she does not practise what she knows. She has written several hundreds of pages which we find extremely dull. She has indulged in one accidental homicide, and there is scarcely another incident in her whole book. It is made up of scenes of love-making and flirtation between a jealous, morbid hero and a light-hearted, feather-headed affectionate heroine. These long scenes of kissing, quarrelling, and teasing occur some in moonlight and some in sunlight, but they are almost all exactly like each other. When we have read one, we may skip the rest of them. Then there are feebler flirtations with an elderly agreeable Frenchman, or Frenchman, as the author chooses to write it, and with a young agreeable German. The rest of the book is padded out with descriptions of life at Baden, and with endless pointless conversations on the weather, Mr. Mallock, Sunday observance, American manners, French manners, English manners, and so on. When her characters are not talking, talking, the author takes up her own parable; a vagrom, desultory parable it often is. Here, for example, are some reflections suggested by the people in the railway station when the night mail is starting for Paris:—

Among those comfortable, cloud-emitting gentlemen, there may be great financiers whom naked truth might call by some other name, not quite so sweet; but at least Inspector Mouchard (who looks quite gentlemanly and distinguished in plain clothes) has nothing disagreeable to say to them; who shall tell indeed in this happy, commercial age when people have learnt to plunder so genially, so naturally, so merrily, who is honest and who is not?—when nothing is sacred from this vast money-making spirit of enterprise and speculation; when even England's fair daughters are content to see their counterfeit presents, modestly appraised at one shilling each, ornamenting the photographer's window together with friendly Zulus, and other celebrities of scanty clothing and scanty reputation; Phryne might surely have been left unmoored in these her photographic strongholds; when every one is clamouring about their "rights" in some shape or other, might she not complain that her services are unduly poached upon?

Buy up your inane, lovely, classical or majestic countenances—Oh! beautiful daughters of Albion! be content to give them to your friends, brothers, husbands even! Then perhaps weak-brained scribblers will cease to pen stupid scurrility concerning you, and to turn dirty pennies by pandering to the depraved taste of a silly minority.

This chat is both bald and disjointed, and chat no better nor more interesting fills up a very large proportion of Alaric Carr's nine hundred pages. Story she has little or none to tell, but what little there is of it seems far from pleasing or probable. We intend to indicate the method by which a novelist of very slight experience or ability might have added to the interest, though nothing could possibly have made the story original or interesting.

Mr. Challoner, the father of the heroine, was a squire with an impoverished estate—Girton—a love of life on the Continent, and a pretty daughter named Reine by a French wife deceased. He had also a ward, named Jasper Treherne, a ward whose face, at least in profile, resembled that of Benvenuto Cellini's Perseus. The ward and the daughter had been friends in youth, were "like brother and sister," and called each other by their Christian names. While Treherne was in London, Reine became engaged to Sir Angus Maxwell, a Perthshire baronet with thirty thousand a year. Maxwell is more of a Dumfriesshire name, and Angus goes ill with it, but that is a matter of insignificant detail. This Angus was an excessively coarse, ill-bred young man, a bully and a snob. Why Reine (who had a soul above monsy) allowed herself to accept his addresses is never explained. Late in the second volume she observes, "I never thought at all—there was the error—looking back it seems incredible to me that any girl in possession of her senses could drift into such a position." Precisely; and as Angus, for the purposes of the story, has to be made an unmitigated young ruffian, her acceptance of his proposal becomes quite unintelligible. Treherne, who was in love with her, naturally thought she had sold herself; however, he went down to Girton, where Angus was to rejoin his betrothed. Reine met Treherne on the ice,

and the pair retired to a cool sequestered seat, where the moonbeams play about Reine's face tenderly, and she speaks to him "in a voice which is itself a caress." He holds her hand in both of his, and to them enters Sir Angus. The accepted lover is naturally somewhat vexed when he contemplates this pretty group. He has already told Reine that her "brotherhood" with Treherne is "Walker" and "bosh." There is a rather angry interview between Reine and Angus, and the girl goes home with her father, leaving the young men to cut figures of eight. Treherne comes back in plenty of time for dinner, but in a moody state of mind. Angus does not come home at all. At last Reine's father and Treherne go in search of him. Mr. Challoner is a curious humourist who amuses himself with the suggestion that Angus has run away from his approaching marriage, nor does he pretend to resent this conduct in the Perthshire bridegroom. The frozen lake is searched, and Angus is found dead. One skate is on his foot, he has fallen on the other, the blade of which is actually wedged tight into his temple. This is, we venture to think, impossible with the present style of skate. When skates had long sharp projecting ends, like some old Dutch articles, the thing might have occurred, but we decline to believe that a modern skate-blade could be "firmly wedged" into the head in the manner described. Perhaps this question can only be settled by experiment. There is a coroner's inquest; Treherne says he left Maxwell skating; the medical evidence shows that he must almost necessarily have fallen, not by accident, but in consequence of a severe blow which has left a bruise behind the ear. The medical witness said:—"I believe that blow behind the ear to have been struck by the hand of another, that the deceased staggered under it, lost his balance, the other foot not being free, and fell with stunning force upon the skate." In face of this evidence, the coroner's jury returned the verdict that "the occurrence was entirely the result of accident."

Even the inexperienced novel-reader now knows all about what happened. Maxwell and Treherne quarrelled, the latter struck the former behind the ear, and Maxwell fell on his skate. This is just what occurred, as Treherne explains at the end of the third volume. But here Alaric Carr leaves her plot for ever, and fills the whole of the rest of her space with descriptions of tours, flirtations, explanations, misunderstandings. Her characters are wonderfully heartless. On the night of the homicide Treherne and Reine sit up together alone, flirting. She faints in his arms, she revives, and they pass the time in reviewing the memories of their childish adventures with boats and the Latin grammar. "Don't try to be cynical, foolish boy," says this sweet girl, whose affianced husband has been killed within six hours by the "foolish boy" with whom she is flirting.

There is another silence: Reine lies with closed eyes, the dark, silky lashes rest upon her cheek, soft, curly cluster round her tiny shell-like ears, and fall across her white, shapely throat; against the crimson cushion she looks pale as marble; her head is thrown back, her arms hang listlessly, the tender, mobile mouth parted, drooping, has a look of suffering. Treherne, watching her surreptitiously out of one eye, is reminded of "Elaine" upon her sable barge, and falls to wondering what particular manner of Launcelot will one day win this "lily-maid."

We protest that, even if the story were better worked out, we could care little for the fortunes of this amiable couple. These fortunes have nothing in them to excite; and Reine scarcely acts in character when, towards the end of the novel, she dismisses Treherne on his confession of Maxwell's homicide. Her first feeling of repulsion she manages to overcome, and proposes to Treherne, at the end of the story, in his chambers in London. The flatness of the story would have been relieved by most writers in a very simple way. Some one—a labourer, or, for choice, a "softy" or village idiot—would have seen Treherne strike the fatal blow; and this witness, though he would not have appeared at the trial, would have kept appearing disagreeably all through the narrative. Finally, his evidence would have come to Reine's ears, or to those of the police. In the latter case we should have had that old favourite with the public, a trial scene; in the former, Reine would have repulsed Treherne, but would have had at least a faint semblance of excuse for returning to him when she heard his version of the story. The village idiot, or the poacher, or whoever it was, would have been a more interesting character than the various commonplace Continental types who are freely introduced. The plot would have been sufficiently well worn even with these alterations; still it would have been a kind of plot. As the story is given to us now, there is scarcely any plot in it at all; and we might almost as well, or perhaps better, occupy our time with reading pictures of travel in the most familiar places on the Continent. Alaric Carr usually writes respectable English, does not give us so much French as many novelists, and shows a respectable range of reading. We do not go so far as to say that confirmed novel-readers will be repelled by her book, and there is some humour and observation in the sketch of Mr. Fretwell, the grumbling Englishman. But we are unable to see in the book that the author shows any promise of future success in fiction. Prophecies of this kind are so often frustrated that we will not say that Alaric Carr can never be a novelist; we only say that we do not expect from her an interesting novel. If she thinks us severe, she is herself much harder on a respectable writer, Bunyan, whose "Pilgrim" she calls wearisome, and on Burns, whom she speaks of as "Bobby."

* *Treherne's Temptation*. By Alaric Carr. London: Smith, Elder, & Co. 1882.

PUBLICATIONS OF THE EARLY ENGLISH TEXT SOCIETY.*

WE confess that we do not understand the principle on which much of the work done by or for the English Dialect Society is carried on. We are not willing to suppose that the contributors are moved by a mere love of bookmaking, or that they cannot distinguish between local usages of words common to many dialects and the possession of words peculiar to any given dialect; nor is the alternative conclusion, that eyes profane have no right to intrude within the circle of their researches, altogether a pleasant one. We are not disposed to give up our right of judgment in questions which are to determine the character of any Aryan words, or to treat as exclusively English words which may also be found in other high or low Dutch forms of speech. We really do not see on what principle such words as *befoul* and *brazen* are to be put down in an Isle of Wight Glossary because they are not pronounced there as they might be in Leicestershire or Norfolk, or because it is therefore necessary to spell them after a different fashion, which yet may not represent the sound to every ear. Apart from the great phonetic controversy, to which we are content to express our aversion, we can but protest against the mountain of work which must be thus piled up. On this subject we have spoken freely and plainly in dealing with previous publications of the English Dialect Society (*Saturday Review*, August 6 and September 3, 1881); and the remarks which we made on Dr. Evans's *Leicestershire Words, Phrases, and Proverbs* apply with greater force to the less meritorious glossaries now before us. In that work the author had deliberately rejected many words as belonging to the English language rather than to the Leicester dialect. These words his son, as editor of the Glossary, restored, adding to them a large number which belong to the same class, and insisting that he was justified in regarding as the property of his native county every word and idiom that came in his way "to which a fair title could be made out, although a number of other dialects might have an equal right to advance the same claim." Mr. Evans, like every one else, is free to do in such matters as he may judge best; but scholars generally, and still more the public at large, may decline the burden of going through a thousand entries where two or three hundred might amply suffice; and still more reasonably may they complain that, not only are they put to most unnecessary trouble, but they lose confidence in the compilers of the glossaries precisely on those points on which confidence is most needed. There is no doubt that every English dialect has its own peculiar words and its own peculiar usages of words, the peculiarity being determined, not by mere sound or spelling, but by the different connotation given to the word. A list of all such words must be of the highest value. But, where the word is common to twenty dialects, it is unreasonable to take a difference of sound, which may strike various hearers in various ways, as a reason for including them in twenty different dictionaries. It is absurd to find the word "planet" in a Leicestershire glossary. If we speak exactly, "planet" is not an English word at all; and in a lexicon professing to give the peculiarities of the several varieties of Aryan speech it should be strictly excluded from the English or German, and indeed from any other section than that to which it properly belongs. Yet in Mr. Evans's book we have the word first in the glossary, in which it ought not to appear, and again in the list of Leicestershire phrases, where it ought to be noticed, inasmuch as the phrase "rim planets" seems peculiar to the county. But, so far as we are told, the word is sounded much as it is elsewhere; and the Leicestershire man means by it much what a Middlesex or a Kentish man might mean by it. The conclusion is that the word is no more Leicestershire than it is Kentish; and the multiplication of such entries becomes a mere waste of type.

In truth, it is not easy to understand all that is said by the toilers in this somewhat ill-defined field of local usages in language. Mr. Evans left it uncertain whether he restricted himself to words obtained from the actual talk of the people, or whether he availed himself also of words found in manuscripts or books; and in editing the Isle of Wight Glossary drawn up by his brother, Major Henry Smith, Mr. Roach Smith makes it difficult for us to follow him when he says that he has "retained every word essential to assist in giving a full and proper notion of the dialect, and of the pronunciation." But probably there is scarcely a single word in the English dictionary to which a genuine speaker of the Isle of Wight dialect would not impart a sound different from that of a speaker belonging to other parts of the country; therefore, every word in the English dictionary is needed to give a full and proper notion of the dialect, and must be included in the local glossary. We are not convinced by the argument; and Mr. Roach Smith seems to have some misgivings as to its cogency, if we may judge by his admission that he may possibly have given a few entries which might have been omitted. We are quite of his opinion when in his list we find the words "aftermath," "agone," "amoost," "barm," "besom," "bran new," "clot," "clout," and a vast number of others, in which there is little difference seemingly of sound, and certainly none of meaning, between the Isle of Wight usage and any other. We cannot understand why such words as "brazen," "befoul," and "chimney" become Isle of Wight words when they are spelt "breyazun,"

"bevoul," and "chimbley," or why "aal to rags" should be an Isle of Wight phrase any more than "all to rags" should be an Essex phrase. We question the legitimacy of putting down "dooman" as the Isle of Wight word for "woman," when we find that it is used only when preceded by "old." It is useless to involve ourselves in a barren controversy when a dozen hearers might insist that the Isle of Wight man said "old 'oman," while one might declare that he said "ol' dooman." Such quarrels only make local philology ridiculous. But, in truth, we lose patience with this Isle of Wight Glossary. "Arenest," we are told, is "to bind a bargain"; in other words, it is a verb; but the example, "I ghid un crown in arenest" shows that it is a noun, and that the usage as well as the meaning is simply that of all or most other parts of England. "Bangun," we are informed, is "great"; but the instance given "he's a bangun great boy" shows that it is merely an expletive of "great," and that it is, in fact, nothing but the common slang expression "banging great," as we have also "thumping great." After the same fashion we read that "playagy" means "very"; but the illustration is "he's a playagy queer chap," and we are thrown back on our old acquaintance "plaguy queer." The legion of such entries might tempt us to throw aside the book as worthless; but to do this would be a great injustice to the honest toil of the collector and to the solid results involved in it. These, it is true, can be brought into practical form only by a diligent process of sifting; but they are nevertheless there. We have real Isle of Wight peculiarities in the expressions "Goo whoaom wi' the wagon deer," or empty; "plotnore," a black clay; "skote," a prop, and many more. But the carelessness of definition meets us everywhere, and fairly destroys all confidence. The entry "Peer, to equal; to compare to," might lead us to expect some such usage as "to peer one man to or with another"; but the only example is "I never zeed the peer to it," and we fail to discover any difference from the phrase as used elsewhere.

The other glossaries given along with Major Smith's Isle of Wight words are those of Oxfordshire, Cumberland, North Lincolnshire, and Radnorshire, the two first being supplementary. The value of these glossaries is not in all cases the same; but none of them is free from the faults of the Isle of Wight portion. Alabaster is not English, and it certainly cannot become an Oxfordshire word because an old woman speaks of herself as having been in her youth "as fair as alabaster." It is not Oxfordshire children alone who talk of "cuckoo spittle," or call others "flabbergasted"; and it is even irritating to be told that a "fall of snow" is Oxfordshire for "a shower of snow." A "shower of snow" is a phrase not commonly heard in any part of England, nor are a fall of rain and a shower of rain exactly the same thing. But it is well to know that "away with," in the sense of "to put up with," or "to endure," still survives in the speech of Oxfordshire folk; "I can't away wi' t." "Baiver," as a workman's meal in the afternoon, assumes in other counties the forms "beaver," or "beever," which is still preserved at Eton; but it is well to give the word, which is closely related with the more familiar "bibber" and "bibbing." The North Lincolnshire Glossary contains seemingly a larger number of these peculiarities in such entries as "izrom," a long or wearisome story; "hawtry," dirty, the A.-S. hōring; "pronkus," a donkey; "syle," to strain milk; "wong," a meadow, and others. In the Radnorshire list "clem" may fairly be given, as connecting the word with the Lancashire usage; but it is hard to see why "wench" should be included, when it has there no other meaning than it has everywhere else.

The Lancashire Glossary, of which Messrs. Nodal and Milner now give us the second part from F to Z, is a work compiled with much greater care, and has an accordingly higher value. It is very necessary to note the local usage of such words as "gar," to make, "gang," to go, "gate," a road, where these words have not found their way into the literary or book English; and we would urge caution only when the word is made to look peculiar merely by a difference of spelling. "Gam," meaning sport or fun, is simply "game"; nor can the variation of sound be great. But "lastgated," quickpaced, with the further sense of reckless, thoughtless, is strictly a local usage; and the more we can have of such entries the better. "Tell-tale-tit" is found almost everywhere, and "gaup" is much the same as "gape"; but "hill" and "hull," to cover, are words which the written English has lost, and the North Lancashire "gay" in the sense of "considerable," may be more readily matched by the "gay clour" which the Dumfriesshire "Dandie Dinmont" cares little for, than by any more southern usage of the word.

Of Turner's *Names of Herbes*, the editor is quite justified in speaking as "a rare and interesting little book." It is so far an independent botanical treatise, as distinguished from a collection of words, that its publication might seem to belong rather to the "Early English Text Society" than to the Dialect Society; but Mr. Britten may undoubtedly plead with reason that it forms a fitting companion to his *Dictionary of English Plant-names*, of which we have already expressed our opinion; and he may further urge that "it will interest those who study the history of cultivated plants, inasmuch as it is the earliest authority to which the introduction of certain plants can be traced; and to the botanist it will be especially useful, inasmuch as it embodies a careful attempt to identify the species recorded with their modern synonyms." As editor, Mr. Britten decided rightly on producing an exact reprint of the work; but in the second part he gives an alphabetical list of the English names given by Turner, each name

* Publications of the Early English Text Society.—Original Glossaries XXIII.—XXVII.—Glossary of the Lancashire Dialect. Part II.—The Names of Herbes. By William Turner. A.D. 1548. Edited by James Britten, F.L.S.

being followed by its modern scientific equivalent, and this by the Latin heading under which Turner places it, and this again by the page of the reprint in which the name will be found. Turner was evidently a hard-working man, who knew that work without system was of little profit. His quaint preface shows the method which he followed, and his method accounts for the accuracy and the usefulness of his work. Like many or most of his time, he was drawn into views not approved by the Council of Trent, and expressed those views with some vehemence; but his name has passed out of mind except as an authority in botany. As such, he is still remembered, and his book has been referred to in fixing the date of the introduction of certain plants into English gardens.

BARRETT'S LIFE OF BALFE.*

MR. BARRETT'S Life of Balfe has the advantage of appearing at an appropriate time; but, without this advantage, its contents could not fail to assert their intrinsic interest. It is a pity that the matter of the book has not been clothed with a better manner than is forthcoming; but there is in the book so much that is curious and interesting to people interested in musical matters, so much that is eminently readable by people who have no special interest in such matters, and so much that will be new to the many people who only dimly associate Balfe's name with the most popular of his works, that the author may be excused for his shortcomings, odd as some of them are. Mr. Barrett begins his work sensibly and pertinently enough by a sketch of the musical condition of England at about the beginning of the present century, and gives a sufficient number of particular instances to illustrate his statement that "musicians lived a sort of moral hand-to-mouth existence, and picked up encouragement and recognition in the same way as they had picked up their education." That, as the author had previously pointed out, music was in what may be termed a bad way at this time, that musicians had no social status as a rule, and that little, if anything, was done to encourage its adoption as a serious profession in England, there can be little doubt. Perhaps Mr. Barrett inquires a little too curiously in seeking for causes for this state of things; but, again, it may very well be that the peculiar spirit of the time, due to extraneous circumstances, was an element, if not the most important element, in the popular estimation of music as an art. Anyhow it was, as Mr. Barrett says, "the dark hour before the dawn." The dawn came, and Balfe had no small share in its coming; but it is unfortunately easy to think Mr. Barrett too sanguine in the opinion he implies in the opening part of his book as to the effect of the movement in favour of English music of which Balfe was for a considerable time the acknowledged leader. Indeed there is too much reason for thinking that, so far as English opera goes, as things were then so are they now. We are fortunate now in possessing an English composer of opera of the first rank among living composers; but his work, famous as it is in Germany, has not yet been heard upon an English stage; and to this day Balfe's own works are far more frequently given on Continental stages than here in England. Balfe had to fight against that extraordinary tendency of the English temperament to depreciate everything of native in favour of everything of foreign growth—a temperament which asserts itself as loudly in other departments as it does in those of art—and it is to be feared that we have not yet succeeded in changing all that. Something in the direction of such a change was done not long since by the manager of an excellent company, which gives operas of various nationalities in the English tongue, by the production of a forgotten opera of Balfe's. But the choice was not happy, and it might have been more to the purpose if the manager had produced the unknown work of a living, instead of the equally unknown and more old-fashioned work of a dead, composer.

Balfe's father, we learn from Mr. Barrett, was an excellent theoretical musician and violin-player, and there is a tradition that the grandfather was a pupil of the famous Matthew Dubourg and a member of the band which played in the first performances of the *Messiah* in Dublin in 1742. Balfe was born in 1808, and very early developed an unmistakable talent for music. There is a characteristic story of his childhood preserved by his surviving relations, and quoted by Mr. Barrett. "He had recently heard an orchestral band perform Haydn's 'Surprise Symphony,' and his lively imagination exaggerated the crash which Haydn introduced upon the half-close of the first movement, to make, as it is said, the ladies jump. A simple arrangement of the themes was one of the pianoforte lessons he had to practice. His mother and sisters were engaged elsewhere in the house, when suddenly they heard a fearful crash, and, as the mother thought, the screams of her child. In terrified haste they rushed into the room in which he had been at work, expecting to find the place in ruins and the boy a corpse. The mother's fright yielded to surprise, her surprise to anger, as she saw the child dancing and crowing with delight. In order to make this 'grand crash' at the proper point of the music, he had piled the fender and fire-irons upon a chair, and had fastened a cord to them all in such a manner as to make them fall with a clatter, and so realize Haydn's design most completely." The little Balfe's first engaged master was William O'Rourke, or, as he was afterwards called, Rooke, and he also got

a good deal of help from the leader of a regimental band named Meadows. In gratitude for this help, the boy, who was then not seven years old, composed a Polacca, of which the score still exists, which he scored for the band. "It was performed exactly as it was written, and so excellent was it in melody and harmony, and so accurately arranged, that the men who played it could with difficulty be brought to believe that it was the unassisted work of a child not yet seven years old." In May, 1816 he made his first public appearance at the Royal Exchange as a solo-violinist, and in 1817 he was advertised to play a concerto as "that wonderful child Master Balfe." After the first grief of his life, his father's death, acting on a sudden impulse, he asked Charles Edward Horn, the singer, who was playing at the theatre in Dublin, to take him to London with him. "His father's death had left his mother very poor; he had no wish to weaken her slender means. He was anxious to qualify himself to earn his own bread, and was willing to do anything which should further this project." Accordingly, he went with Horn to London in 1823, and was engaged to play at the Oratorio Concerts at Drury Lane, of which Mori was the leader and Sir George Smart the conductor. Not only was he soon selected to play a violin solo on alternate nights with Mori, but Mori had no hesitation in occasionally resigning the leadership of the band to a boy of fifteen. Between 1825 and 1826 he discovered, through mimicking Horn in his favourite part, Caspar in the *Freischütz*, that he had a voice as powerful as his master's; and, after a course of vocal training, resolved to try his fortune as a stage singer. He was engaged to appear at Norwich as Caspar, but was overcome by stage-fright, and could not do himself justice. Soon afterwards he fell in, at an evening party, with a certain Count Mazzara, who had recently lost his only son, and whose delight in Balfe's musical genius was increased by his discovering a strong likeness between Balfe and this son. This led to the young musician going to Italy with the Count, and staying for a considerable time at the Palazzo Mazzara in Rome, which he left to follow his then master Federici to Milan.

The Scala was then under the management of Glossop, who, being an Englishman, was with difficulty persuaded that a compatriot could be possessed of any remarkable talent. Yet Balfe's qualifications as a vocalist were high enough. He had worked hard at the training of his fine voice, and "he could read at sight any music placed before him, whether it was for the voice, the pianoforte, or the violin. This was a power not possessed by one in ten in those days. The répertoire of an operatic vocalist was only added to after much labour and frequent repetitions. In every one of the Italian towns where there was an opera-house and a troop of singers was to be found an old musician, whose business it was to teach singers their parts by constantly and persistently drumming them into their ears. Balfe's knowledge of music would save the trial and expense of all this drudgery, and he could dispense with the aid of the *répétiteur*." Glossop, though he would not at first hear of engaging Balfe as a singer, presently gave him a commission to write a score for the ballet of *La Perouse*, the result of which was that the Milanese cared much more for the music than for the spectacle, to which Glossop had thought it would be entirely subordinate. Then Glossop promised him an engagement as a singer, and he continued his vocal studies with Filippo Galli, for whom the part of Assur in *Semiramide* had been written. Glossop, however, soon afterwards gave up La Scala, and Balfe, going back to Paris and to Cherubini, who had previously shown him much kindness, was there introduced to Rossini. In the course of their first evening together, Balfe sang "Largo al factotum" to his own accompaniment at the piano. Rossini was delighted, but said jokingly that he was sorry he had heard it, "as until this time I imagined that no one in the world could do that but myself." By the aid of Rossini and of a M. Gallois, Balfe received further training under Bordogni, and before twelve months were over appeared as Figaro in *Il Barbiere* at the Italiens, and was so successful that Laurent, the manager, immediately engaged him for three years. He sang all the principal baritone parts, and in the course of his engagement was asked to write in some music in the *Romeo and Juliet* of Zingarelli, who was too old himself to undertake the task. This he did with complete success, and soon afterwards set to work at an opera on the subject of *Atala*. Then his health obliged him to leave Paris for a time, and he went back to Milan, carrying the unfinished score and a good deal of other MS. music with him. He sang at Palermo, where in 1830 he also produced an opera, *I Rivali*; and, going back to Milan, was then engaged to write another opera, *Enrico Quarto*, for which he received the magnificent sum of two hundred francs. In Paris he had produced yet another opera, *Un Avvertimento di Gelosi*, in which Ronconi made his second appearance on the operatic stage. At Milan, by the influence of Malibran, he was engaged for a tour in which she was the leading singer, and which was organized by the late Signor Puzzi, famous both as an impresario and as a player on the French horn, to whom there has been no successor but M. Vivier. Puzzi induced him to come back to England, and he accordingly started, accompanied by his newly-married wife, who had been Mile. Lima Roser, a distinguished singer, "and a member of a distinguished Hungarian family." One misfortune befall him—the loss of the chest containing the score of *Atala* and other music, which was never recovered. In 1833 he sang at the Ancient Concerts, and in 1834 he was engaged to write *The Siege of Rochelle* to Fitzball's libretto for the English Opera House, now the Lyceum. The work was,

* *Balfe: his Life and Work.* By William Alexander Barrett. London: Remington & Co.

however, produced by Bunn at Drury Lane—with how great a success is well known. Of course he was attacked as well as lauded, and it was said that *The Siege of Rochelle* was stolen from Ricci's *Chiara di Rosenberg*, the score of which was, in answer to the accusation, laid side by side with Balfé's at the principal music-publishers for inspection by the critics. "Both works," remarks Mr. Barrett, "were printed in musical characters, and it was not a *sine quid non* of a musical critic's business in those days that he should understand the alphabet of the subject upon which he was called upon to write learned and eloquent disquisitions." What Mr. Barrett has to say about the composition of *The Siege of Rochelle* is worth quoting:—

English musicians were at that time struggling for encouragement. John Barnett's "Mountain Sylph" had been produced, and had made itself deservedly popular. Edward Loder had written his "Nourjahad" abounding with melody and musical contrivance. Each of these operas reproduced the style which Sir Henry Bishop had made popular. In the first "The Magic-wave Scarf" was an earnest and successful attempt to introduce the dramatic element into an opera in a more serious style than had been hitherto attempted by English composers. Balfé's music went further than either composer had as yet ventured in the region of dramatic expression. All the concerted pieces in "The Siege of Rochelle" seem to grow out of the situations and exactly to express them, as well as to intensify them. The orchestra had work to do which required attention and could not be "simplified" or "guessed at." The Overture actually contained phrases of canonic imitation, and was written in that modification of Sonata-form which had already begun to make itself distinguished in the Overture and was counted as a development. In every place there was a respect for the demands of form. The melodies were such as the listener delighted in, and the singer loved to execute. The harmonies were rich and new.

In short Balfé had shown in his "Siege of Rochelle" that he had made a distinct artistic advance, and had set a pattern which might be expanded and extended by all who had the power and the will to advance the claims of English musical practical science. The public hailed his efforts with delight. Musicians trembled at his innovations and daring ideas, and tried to make themselves believe that they were all wrong. They copied his patterns however, and flourished on the new knowledge they had thus helped themselves to.

From this time onward Balfé's success was assured; and, having arrived at this point, we may leave readers to pursue his career with the help of Mr. Barrett's pages, which are full of information and of pleasant anecdote. It is to be regretted that the author, or some competent person for him, has not seen the work more carefully through the press. Among various tiresome errors we note in p. 32 *exerted* for *exacted*, in p. 69 *Romia* for *Rosina*, in p. 160 *Staudigl* for *Staudigl*, in p. 222 *seige* for *siege*, and in p. 235 *Le Noces* for *Les Noces*. But the worst collection of misprints is found in this note to p. 141:—

—
Sa musique est chatoyante, elle resplendit comme une pierre fine et montre mille facets que émerveillent et séduisent.

The author's style is by no means free from reproach; and it is odd to find him asserting that there is an impenetrable obscurity of meaning in Rossini's saying that he would write no more until the Jews had finished their Sabbath. Not the less, however, has Mr. Barrett produced a book which is both interesting and readable.

HAMERTON'S GRAPHIC ARTS.*

THIS massive and authoritative treatise on the technical part of almost every branch of fine art forms a singular comment on the condition of taste in England, and one which it is impossible to contemplate without a certain satisfaction. Nothing can be more salutary at the present time than to turn from the abstract to the concrete, from æsthetic theories to the practice of craftsmen, and from the foolish foppishness of those who talk about art to the active performance of those who make it. It is plain that both theoriser and practitioner must exist side by side, and live to interpret one another; but if we were to listen merely to the social satirists of the day, we should be tempted to think that the balance had become seriously disturbed, and that the connoisseur amongst us was overpowering the artist. A few blatant apostles of a "new Renaissance" on green and pink tissue-paper, a few Laura Matildas of the monthly press, are sufficient to make a very considerable stir and bustle in our ears, and to induce us to exaggerate their numerical importance. Fortunately the quiet people who are practising mezzotint and dry point, and all the other fascinating graphic arts of which Mr. Hamerton has so much to tell us, are not as a rule to be reckoned among those that strive and cry, and a vast amount of work fitted to give genuine æsthetic pleasure is being produced and valued in spite of the professional "æsthetes." Mr. Hamerton's book will do good service in reminding those who have laughed at the caricatures of Mr. Du Maurier and of Mr. Gilbert that the ridiculous figures which have been carried forward on the wave of our latest artistic revival have nothing in common with the genuine craftsmen of the age. The volume should rather be considered as a supplement to and a commentary on Mr. William Morris's *Hopes and Fears for Art*. We may say that a young man whose ideas have been stimulated by Mr. Morris, and who feels drawn to work out his individuality by the skill of his hands, will naturally come to Mr. Hamerton to learn what to choose and how to set about the work selected. It is this practical and exact character which gives *The Graphic Arts* its

peculiar value; it is a book which enshrines the labour and observation of a lifetime, and the scope of which is so wide that it is doubtful whether there are more than two or three men living in England—and those two or three not handiers of the pen—who are competent to deal with it critically in all its branches. It is the masterpiece of Mr. Hamerton, the goal towards which the various fragments of his previous literary work may now all be seen to have tended.

It would be a mistake, however, to consider that Mr. Hamerton's attention has been entirely directed to the technical side of the matter. This book is not an encyclopædia of terms in use among professional artists. Yet it is obvious that his own practice as an artist has given him a certain scorn for the purely theoretical art critic, and that he is glad of an opportunity of speaking as himself a craftsman. He reminds us sometimes of the young Frenchman who said he must know more about pictures than Gustave Planche because he had worked in pastel and could play the violin. This appeals to a very general tendency in popular opinion, one which is at the root, perhaps, of all public distrust of merely outside criticism. In some of the arts, without doubt, a certain knowledge of the procedure is indispensable to intelligent connoisseurship. The critic of sculpture who is not quite sure whether the master does not hack his bust, by inspiration, out of a mass of marble, is hardly a safe guide on plastic matters. He ought to have seen a sculptor model, and to have some notion of the mysteries of pointing and carving. Whether he cannot learn all that is needful by watching the process is another question; the public, at all events, will hardly trust his opinion unless they have seen him with the chisel in his hand. In the case of the minor arts this practical experience is less urgently required. It would be absurd to think that no one could judge *camaieu* without having painted a blue shepherdess and a blue rose-tree on a Sèvres cup; nor should the requirement ever be pushed to any great excess. We may allow that, as a general rule, a critic who has worked, even if only as an amateur, gains immensely in sureness of judgment by that technical practice. Mr. Hamerton's skill as an etcher qualifies him to speak with authority on this branch of his subject; and we gather that in most of the other fields of graphic art he has either worked as an amateur or has patiently observed professionals at work.

The first four chapters of the book are dedicated to an examination of the scope and limitations of the graphic arts. A strong distinction is drawn between useful and æsthetic drawing—between, that is to say, drawing which has no other object than to give accurate information, and that which is primarily intended to give pleasure. We do not recollect to have seen this distinction so clearly insisted on before, and some interesting suggestions regarding the ordinary newspaper illustrations of the day are put forward. It is ingeniously urged that designs intended to give us an exact impression of a place or an event which occupies public curiosity for the moment should no more be elaborated with purely ornamental details, or worked up into a piece of fine art, than an architect's plans, or a series of anatomical drawings, should be. During the late war in Egypt one of our illustrated papers took Mr. Hamerton's hint, and gave us one or two rough outlines of the scenes in the streets of Alexandria about which we were all demanding exact information. But the experiment did not seem to be appreciated by the public, and it was not repeated. An amusing and instructive instance of the right and the wrong way in which a contemporary event can be treated in illustration, and of the danger of effect and composition in such cases, is worth quoting:—

The Cape mail steamer, the *American*, founded in mid-ocean in April 1880, from the rupture of the screw-shaft. The weather was calm, and the interesting point of the whole story is that the captain and other people were as calm as the weather, and that there was no confusion in their proceedings. They first breakfasted quietly, and then quitted the ship in the boats, which started in good order with a sufficient sailing breeze and all sails set. These interesting facts were illustrated in the *Graphic* in plain, truthful woodcuts from sketches by the chief officer of the vessel. A French illustrated newspaper treated the wreck in the grand, imaginative style. In the French artist's vigorous sketch the *American* was tossed in such a terrific sea as only occurs in the most furious Atlantic gales. She was dismasted, and in such a condition of wild and helpless disorder that it would have been impossible to launch even a life-boat. The artist had appealed powerfully to the feelings, and his sketch proved very considerable rough ability in its way; but observe how, by missing the facts of the real incident, he at the same time missed its peculiar and exceptional interest, and confounded a remarkable and unique occurrence with the crowd of ordinary shipwrecks resulting from mere bad weather.

When Mr. Hamerton fairly starts in the work which he has taken in hand, we are struck with his tolerance and the breadth of his views. He seems to have no preferences, to despise no true art, and to be as careful of overlooking the claims of one medium as fearful of exaggerating those of another. His judicious attitude in this respect gives weight to his instructions. He is unwilling to believe that any art in which a great man has been content to work in past times can be unworthy of serious attention now. Even etching was till lately so much despised that the reputation of Rembrandt himself was not sufficient to keep it from the charge of being "a defective substitute for engraving." Mr. Ruskin, as we all know, used to talk of "etching, a blundering art." In like manner water-colour was formerly considered an occupation fit for none but young ladies at boarding-schools. If such prejudices in these particular instances seem to us now singularly vain and irrational, may it not be that those arts which are at this moment out of fashion may again, and that perhaps shortly, reassume their dignity? Within the last few months, Mr. Herkomer, one of the most ingenious of our

* *The Graphic Arts; a Treatise on the Varieties of Drawing, Painting, and Engraving.* By Philip Gilbert Hamerton. London: Seeley, Jackson, & Halliday.

artists, has achieved repeated popular success of a very decided kind with one of the most antiquated of graphic arts—mezzotint. It seems quite likely that, in a similar manner, woodcutting and lithography have but to find another Bewick and another Bellange to resume their old position among the fashionable arts. As an example of Mr. Hamerton's breadth and openness of mind, we may point to his excellent chapter on pastel. If any medium could be expected to be out of sympathy with a vigorous modern mind largely occupied with the more heroic effects of the burin and the brush, it would be that fragile arrangement of dry powders on paper which so thoroughly suited the graceful frivolity of the eighteenth century in France, and which a breath of the free wind of heaven is sufficient to discompose and to destroy. The man who works in pastel must, we might rashly suppose, be a *petit-maitre* and a dandy. A thought of the laborious and worthy lives of such men as Latour and Chardin rebukes the ungenerous reflection, and Mr. Hamerton gives to this form of practice, the velvet softness of which has so dangerous a charm for amateurs, at least as much intelligent analysis as to any other. His theory is that no art in which an excellent artist finds it convenient to express himself can be unworthy of attention and cultivation. In this very matter of pastel he cites some very interesting examples of the value which the rapid method of working has given in cases where accurate records of evanescent effects of colour are desired, and he mentions that a well-known landscape-painter has long availed himself of this art in order to secure impressions of effects which in nature do not last more than five minutes or less.

A chapter on silver-point, in which this refined and accurate medium is strongly recommended, is followed by one on the lead pencil. It will probably be new to most non-technical readers to learn that this instrument has since 1865 been almost entirely abandoned for serious and elaborate work in favour of the pen. We then pass to the consideration of sanguine, chalk, and black stone; and in a succeeding chapter to that of charcoal, on the history of which, and its recent development as an instrument of rare value in expression, Mr. Hamerton is particularly interesting. Two chapters on water monochrome and on oil monochrome prepare us for that on pastel, to which we have just referred; and we are then led on to the consideration of those great public arts of tempera and fresco, in which recent practice has enjoyed so very limited a success. We proceed to painting in oil and varnish, to painting in water-colours, and to painting on tapestry, the whole work closing with a series of very interesting remarks on the comparative value and the true mission of the minor arts which seem most obviously to answer to the epithet "graphic"—such as engraving, etching, mezzotint, and lithography. With this last chapter a work on *The Graphic Arts* which will not easily be superseded is brought to a worthy close.

Any notice of this work must, however, be incomplete if it passes over in silence the illustrations which it contains. They are copious, they have been selected from the masterpieces of ancient and modern art with great care, and they have been reproduced by a curious variety of processes with a skill and success which is fairly extraordinary. A few years ago such an illustration as that in page 116, where a study of two female heads by Watteau is given in facsimile, would have been considered impossible. The original drawing presents a careful and most ingenious combination of red, white, and black chalk on tinted paper, and the reproduction seems to give us the very movement of the stump, the light abrasion of the chalks on the high surfaces, and the soft crumble of the vanishing touch. Mr. Hamerton particularly calls attention to another illustration, from Mercuri's line-engraving after the "Sainte-Amélie" of Delaroche, and gives it as his opinion that this is the most difficult test of reproduction which has yet been attempted, on account of the extreme delicacy of some lines and the sharpness of others. This wonderful facsimile is the result of a process known as *photogravure*, the secret of which is retained by Messrs. Goupil. Another very skilful operator who has contributed to the volume is M. Paul Dujardin, whose system of *héliogravure* reproduced delicate effects of lead pencil with extraordinary effect. A study in silver-point by Sir Frederick Leighton, and a pen-and-ink drawing by Mr. Boughton, are given in facsimile as instances of what can be done by the more familiar process of mechanical autotype, and a series of wood-cuts by Dürer, Holbein, and others have been entrusted to Messrs. A. and W. Dawson. The combined efforts of these ingenious inventors have given us the best illustrated book of the year, a beautiful work of lasting value.

VALENTINA.*

VALENTINA is rightly described as a sketch, and she is a decidedly original one. We have in her a character which, strictly speaking, may be barely possible, but which consistently sets probabilities at defiance as she persistently outrages all the proprieties. And yet we recognize much of truth and nature in a portrait which is roughly struck out in spirited outline. This pure-minded and high-born maiden, with her manners that are more than frank, and her aggressive independence of action, seems up to a certain point to disarm evil by her innocence of it. Subsequently, it is true, she suffers deeply when she

acts upon her emotions or on precipitate impulses; and so the life that once promised to be sunny is charged with all the varieties of light and shade. The sketch of Valentina rises above the ordinary level of the sentimental women of fiction, inasmuch as the author enters into the passions and feelings of her impetuous heroine, and we have tragedy rapidly alternating with comedy, and pathos that is brightened and relieved by humour. We may well doubt whether a Valentina ever existed; but she is such a girl as the French novelists analyse as "a study"; and certainly her behaviour and her wayward resolutions give the reader matter for much curious speculation. And, in another way, the novel is original, inasmuch as most of the reader's anticipations are baffled. We fancy we foresee the inevitable course of the plot; we are absolutely assured that we can foretell the end; and lo! almost all our expectations are disappointed. The wayward heroine will insist upon "putting her foot in it" just when her path seems to be comparatively smooth and when all would have come right had she only waited. And the still more provoking hero will hesitate and hang back when he has only to speak out and be the happiest of mortals, notwithstanding that over-caution is not his habit, and that his character is not supposed to be lacking in decision. So that the author hurries us from surprise to surprise; and we hardly know whether or not to call it a blemish in her work that the sensations which she arranges for us are invariably disagreeable.

The opening of the story, if we regard it retrospectively, is sufficiently startling. Three gay young Englishmen, setting out for a foreign tour, have stopped to spend a few days in Paris; and all the three are fated to be profoundly interested in the fortunes of a girl with whom one of them has a strange adventure. In fact, we may say at once that two of the three are to marry the young lady, and the one whom she is merely destined to regard as a friend is the very man whom the Fates seemed to have marked as her husband. Roger Miles is strolling in the Champs Elysées of a Sunday evening in summer, when his attention, even as an inexperienced stranger, is arrested by an astounding phenomenon. He sees a graceful young English girl abroad, apparently on the same errand as himself, and sauntering under the alleys in sublime unconsciousness of the admiration she excites among the professional flâneurs. Miles's chivalry is awakened at the vision of this innocent lamb turned loose among ravening wolves. For, as for her simplicity and innocence, he never questions them for a moment; and accordingly he decides to accost her, though with natural awkwardness. He might have spared himself any feeling of embarrassment; and her easy manner, with the ready flow of her confidences, places him immediately at his ease. She is quite intelligent enough to understand that the stalwart young gentleman means well by her and that his escort may be useful. She listens amiably to the advice he ventures to offer; she is neither irritated nor scandalized by the astonishment he expresses; she gladly accepts his hesitating proposal to see her home; she shows a childlike curiosity in himself and his family and all his belongings; and when he has brought her to the door of the handsome hotel she inhabits, she suggests that he should come in and be presented to her mother. As it happens, the proffered introduction does not come off, and Miles bids adieu to the fair *incognita*, puzzling himself sorely as to who she may be, and speculating as to whether they are ever likely to meet again. Their future meeting is of course one of the points in the story as to which the author can have none of her surprises in store for us. Lady Valentina turns up under the roof of a sister, who is married to one of Mr. Miles's nearest country neighbours, and the elder brother of Frank Hartless, one of Miles's comrades of travel. For Valentina proves to be the daughter of an earl, although she has no dowry to speak of, and so is bound to do well for herself in marriage. She is the same bright, feather-brained creature as before; she willingly recognizes Roger's claims to old friendship; and as the handsome young squire is a fairly eligible match, there seems no reason why they should not make a marriage of it. But thenceforward, as Dickens's Lancastrian mechanic says in *Hard Times*, Lady Valentina's existence is all a muddle. As Miles will remain obtusely silent, she is cajoled into espousing honest Billy Golding, who has the double merit of being rich and extremely good-natured. The marriage, for the very short time it lasts, is by no means unhappy, as might have been expected. Miles recognizes that, if there was a fault anywhere, the fault was his; and he and his former travelling companion remain fast friends. As for Lady Valentina Golding, she does her duty as a wife, and keeps up the dignity of a wealthy and high-born matron, according to her own peculiar notions. She treats her husband as the good fellow deserves who is always ready to draw liberal cheques, or to fall in with her most fantastic wishes. All that she does is right in his eyes, and he is her staunch and loyal champion when she is the object of sneers or of animadversions; though it must be confessed that the patience of the meekest of ordinary husbands would have been driven beyond all bounds of endurance. Valentina rattles out, as she always did, whatever chances to come uppermost; she delights, as she always had done, in astounding her guests and scandalizing her relations; she keeps up, although in all honour, the old familiar intimacy with Mr. Miles; and she never enjoys herself half so much as when she goes on a madcap bird-nesting expedition with the coachman's little grandson. So far, the playful element is in the ascendant, and the beautiful young lady would seem to be as soulless as the forest water nymph in *La Motte Fouquet's* tale. But when the kind and stupid husband is suddenly and seriously taken ill, a change comes over the spirit of her

* *Valentina: a Sketch.* By E. C. Price, Author of "A French Heiress," &c. London: Chatto & Windus. 1882.

dreams. The indifference that looked like selfish heartlessness is replaced by tenderness and anxious devotion; and when poor Billy is laid in his foreign grave, he has veritable mourners in his widow and her friend Roger.

Now, of course, we might have supposed that, after a decorous delay, the widow and her constant admirer would come together. But in counting upon this we had been reckoning without the cold and crafty Mr. Hartless, who has as much constancy of purpose as Miles, with a greater capacity for resolute action. The motives of Hartless are mixed, and the mixture is scarcely in keeping with his character as it is otherwise suggested. He was always supposed to have loved Lady Valentina for her own sake, and we are assured that he would have married her even had she been left penniless—an assertion which we must take the liberty of questioning. That he really admired her personal attractions we do not doubt, and we are persuaded that he was passionately in love with her fortune. One of the most striking flaws in the probabilities of the plot is that Roger Miles, although forewarned by sad experience, should let the lady he has lost once before slip through his fingers a second time. This, however, he does; Hartless marries her by the help of their common relatives; and it is then that the sunshine of her life is clouded over, as the remainder of the story is enveloped in gloom. Hartless is the very reverse of the careless, kind-hearted Golding. He resolves to break his wife of her capricious fancies, and means to teach her to behave in time like other women of her station. We need not say that the manners and habits of which he is determined to get rid are closely bound up with all the fibres of her nature. She cannot bend herself to his stern discipline if she would; and, naturally, she revolts from the first against the authority that is so arbitrarily exercised. Fortunately we are not initiated into the details of the processes of slow torture by which the wild and high-spirited girl is changed into a heart-broken woman, moving painfully about upon springs that seem to be set mechanically in motion. In fact, when we meet her for the last time as Lady Valentina Hartless, it is too late even for the author to change her fate by killing her cruel husband out of the way. The curtain drops on a melancholy deathbed, and on Miles lamenting her memory when he has buried all his hopes in her tomb. For ourselves, looking at the story artistically, we should have been inclined to reserve a gleam of brightness for the close, especially considering the previous protracted strain upon our feelings. But we never dispute the title of an author to shape his incidents according to his will; and if the *dénouement* is almost perversely sorrowful, we are bound to say that, in point of dramatic intensity, the book is brought powerfully to a close at its best.

AMERICAN LITERATURE.

DR. HAMILTON'S treatise on metaphysics (1) will hardly perhaps fulfil the purpose for which, if we rightly understand the preface, its author designed it. To furnish the American students of metaphysics with a national standard work upon the subject, if this was really Dr. Hamilton's intention, was an ambitious project; and considering how very large and important a part of American literature upon all subjects, the history of their own country excepted, is of foreign origin, there seems no special reason why such an attempt should have been made. There are in other branches of study much stronger motives for an endeavour to furnish Americans with works suitable to their peculiar ideas of education and habits of reading. Superficiality is to an extraordinary extent characteristic, not merely of the general reader, but even of those who in the States are called and would call themselves students. Few men have the sense and self-dependence to resist the general tendency—to content themselves with a real knowledge of a few subjects, instead of that smattering of all which is the object of the majority, and which in their estimation constitutes culture, if not scholarship. Consequently, there is a great demand for abridgments or manuals upon all kinds of subjects, from classics and history to geology and physics. But metaphysics hardly form a part of the regular course of collegiate study; and, to do Dr. Hamilton justice, his work is too large and too solid for any but a student who has time and attention to give; though, apparently with a just appreciation of his countrymen's taste and temper, he has done his utmost to make it as readable as a metaphysical treatise can possibly be. The danger is that the reader will be disposed to skip what is technical and scientific, and dwell upon the anecdotes by which these drier portions of the work are connected and illustrated. The chapters which deal with the phenomena of dreaming, of spectral illusion, and of hallucination in general, will probably be read and remembered by five men for one who really masters the principles of the work. And we are not sure that, so far as real instruction is concerned, such readers may not benefit as much as their more conscientious fellows. The facts which Dr. Hamilton has collected certainly tend to throw light on those aberrations and abnormal actions of the brain in which scientific psychologists have so often sought a clue to the mystery of its regular working; and the author has caught a glimpse, if he has not a very clear or complete grasp, of

the strange relation and resemblance between the illusions of sleep and those peculiar to the milder or incipient forms of insanity. He has missed, we think, some facts which might have given a clue to the nature of that resemblance, and perhaps to its origin; as, for example, the tendency of a fevered or disordered brain to reproduce in waking the actual visions of its sleep, and the strange sequence of ideas in both—a sequence utterly independent of logic or reason, and therefore seldom traceable by observation or memory, but, when it can be so traced, seeming to depend on some such association of words rather than of thoughts, as a silent watcher may sometimes perceive in the tendency of a discursive conversation.

Mr. Weston's treatise on Money (2) is of modest scope and moderate dimensions, and on the whole sensible and useful. It is, however, a controversial rather than a didactic work; and though the author's views are generally sound and never absurd—praise which cannot be given to a tithe of the works on currency which form so large and so worthless a part of the economical literature of nearly every civilized country—he is not a guide to be implicitly trusted by those who have not studied the general principles of the subject in works of greater depth and higher authority. The dogmatic coolness with which Mr. Weston indicates what he calls the errors of men of incomparably deeper knowledge and sounder judgment than himself should be a warning to the uncritical reader, and is the less excusable because Mr. Weston's errors are palpable, and occasionally very glaring. A more modest appreciation of his own judgment and information might have led him to look a little deeper into those questions of principle upon which he differs, not only from the soundest economists, but from the almost universally received convictions common to the thorough economist and the practical statesman. What is most valuable in the book is the clearness with which the author states the bearing of political upon monetary considerations, the effect upon the value of gold and silver of that function which they derive from Governmental or social action, and the relation between the quantity and the value of any form of currency. Few writers of his grade have perceived so distinctly where lies the fatal danger of a paper circulation; have understood with equal clearness, on the one hand, that paper money, confined within sufficiently narrow limits, will retain a value equal to that of gold or silver, and, on the other, how unlikely, how all but impossible, it is that a State which has once had recourse to such a currency should keep it within the necessary bounds. Some very sound and very careful economists have failed to bring home as forcibly to the reader's mind how largely the exchange value, the market price, so to speak, of the precious metals depends upon their function as money. In all those respects in which value depends upon demand, the value of gold and silver largely depends upon their use and acceptance as the medium of exchange throughout the world, not upon their use in their numerous minor capacities. From most of the common errors more current in America than anywhere else, Mr. Weston is tolerably free. But the experience of his own country should have precluded such a mistake as that which he makes with regard both to silver and to paper in their relations to gold. So far from its being true that silver cannot be depreciated in regard to gold till it has driven out all the gold where the two are in circulation together, it is of course precisely by its depreciation that it drives out the gold. Not until silver becomes a cheaper instrument of payment than gold in a bimetallic country, while gold still retains its full advantage elsewhere, does the latter metal begin to disappear from circulation. Because silver is depreciated, men pay their debts in silver, and gold is sent where it can purchase silver at its market value, not at that arbitrarily fixed by Government. A still grosser and almost incredible mistake is the statement that the value of greenbacks was not affected by the probability of their redemption. That value fluctuated with every variation of fortune during the war—fluctuated so that gold was at one time worth fifty per cent. premium, at another worth a hundred and fifty. How did a Confederate victory depreciate greenbacks, or a Federal success restore their value, except by affecting the belief of the public in the certainty and speediness of their redemption? Why did the Confederate paper bear so much lower a value? Not merely because it was at last issued in yet more exaggerated quantities, but because its repudiation was always probable, and became more and more certain as the war proceeded. It is hardly possible that a writer like Mr. Weston should have made so wild a statement if he had ever considered this aspect of the subject even for five minutes.

The two volumes before us (3) bring down Mr. Scribner's series of the *Campaigns of the Civil War* nearly to a close. The march of Sherman, first on Atlanta, and then upon the sea, was by no means the splendid feat of arms, the marvellous achievement of military daring and genius, that it has been represented. The general who undertook and carried it out would have deserved no common disgrace had he failed with the means at his command. Had two players of Kriegspiel found themselves in the position of the two armies, still more of the two countries, at the point at which the story of these volumes begins, fighting with

(1) *The Human Mind: a Treatise on Mental Philosophy.* By Edward J. Hamilton, D.D. New York: Carter & Brothers. London: Trübner & Co. 1882.

(2) *Money.* By Geo. M. Weston, Author of "The Silver Question" &c. New York: B. Homans. London: Trübner & Co. 1882.

(3) *Campaigns of the Civil War—Atlanta.* By Jacob D. Cox, LL.D. *The March to the Sea—Franklin and Nashville.* By Jacob D. Cox, LL.D. New York: C. Scribner's Sons. London: Trübner & Co. 1882.

pins and counters, the representative of the Confederacy must have owned himself conquered, and with no choice but speedily to surrender at discretion. The Confederacy was then in a position scarcely less hopeless than that of Napoleon in 1815. The Mississippi, the Gulf, the Atlantic, were in the hands of the enemy; the Confederacy was shut in on all four sides by a Power which on each frontier could have assembled a force equal to the entire strength of the Confederate armies, and have supplied each force with all military necessities and with any number of recruits from an unassassable base. Sherman's army outnumbered the utmost force opposed to him always by three to two, sometimes by two to one. Johnston, a first-rate strategist, had but one means of opposing the invader—to take up successively the strongest possible positions on the road to the chief arsenal of the Confederacy. He made the most of every position he assumed, and failed in every case through his inability to resist the simplest of all military manoeuvres. Sherman had only to retain Johnston in position with one half of his force while he swung the other round by right or left, and so turned his adversary's flank and compelled him to retreat. This is in brief the history of the march to Atlanta. The march to the sea was a still easier and safer feat. By that time the utter hollowness of the Confederate defence had become apparent. Hood, who had replaced Johnston, commanded the only strong Confederate force except that in Virginia, and, had Sherman's been in the same position, Hood's counter-march upon his communications might have compelled a retreat. But Sherman knew that there was in Tennessee a Federal force besides his own far stronger than that of Hood, a force which could be strengthened to any extent from the enormous numbers at the command of his Government. He could therefore leave Hood to march upon almost certain defeat, and pursue his own course without regarding the menace to his communications. Indeed, had these communications been cut, it mattered little. He had only to march through a rich and defenceless country to reach a new base on the sea, having in his front nothing that deserved to be called a hostile army, nothing indeed that could even seriously harass him. The campaign of Franklin and Nashville was thus a mere sequel to that of Atlanta, and a sequel whose result was predetermined. Sherman could trust Thomas to dispose of Hood; and even a Confederate victory in Tennessee would have come too late to prevent his holding Savannah and receiving ample supplies and reinforcements there. Dr. Cox is, of course, by no means desirous of showing how easy was his hero's task, how certain on every ground of military calculation was its success. But even his statement of the facts shows clearly to one who can read between the lines how much more military and strategic honour attached to Johnston's defence than to Sherman's victorious march. Perhaps the credit due to the latter is rather that of having discerned the situation while his Government was still blind to it, of having perceived that the back of the Confederacy was broken while Lee's splendid defence of Virginia still imposed upon Lincoln, Stanton, and Halleck.

The First Annual Report of the Ethnological Bureau (4) is a splendid example of those great official contributions to American literature of which we have so often spoken. The jobbery and extravagance that characterize Federal administration and Federal expenditure at large do not seem to affect the military or scientific departments. Whatever amount of money Congress votes for the explorations and investigations, geographical, geological, and antiquarian, that have ever since the war done so much to enlarge our knowledge of prehistoric America—and the votes have never been extravagantly liberal—it has obtained abundant value in return. This is due, no doubt, chiefly to the fact that the politicians can hardly pretend to take any part in the work. It must be trusted either to men of established scientific reputation, or to officers of the scientific branches of the army—men who are not partisans, and are untainted by political associations. It is a characteristic fact that the supreme charge of the new department of Ethnology was entrusted to no political or civil officer, to no one in the direct service of the United States, but to the Secretary of that Smithsonian Institute which performs for the States many of the functions of our Royal Society. With that gentleman rests the responsibility of the selection of Mr. J. W. Powell for the immediate charge of the work in hand, and on him, consequently, must be reflected a fair share of the honour which the volume before us unquestionably deserves. It is as elaborate, minute, painstaking, and finished in detail as work of this kind in the hands of American engineers or men of science always is. It has the common fault of the genus; it is padded with papers on general ethnological, glossological, and mythological questions by no means essential, and not always relevant, to the business in hand. But those chapters—by far the largest part of this ponderous quarto—which deal with actual facts of prehistoric American life, with the languages, the customs, the relations, and especially the various burial practices of the aboriginal tribes, form a most valuable contribution to ethnological science. The chapter on the burial practices of the Indians, illustrated by numerous excellent photographs, would of itself form an interesting and valuable monograph, such as unfortunately few men of adequate capacity and information could afford to undertake, still less to publish on their own account. The ground still open to the

(4) *First Annual Report of the Bureau of Ethnology to the Secretary of the Smithsonian Institution, 1879-80.* By J. W. Powell, Director. Washington: Government Printing Office. London: Trübner & Co. 1881.

inquiries of the department is enormous; the materials, imperfect as they are, much having been lost irrevocably before the great West was practically opened up to scientific explorers, is still very abundant. And if the department should at last be able to throw real light upon the history and connexions of the great people who once occupied so large a part of the present area of the United States—the Mound Builders, whose works extend from the Lakes almost to the Gulf, and from the Mississippi to the Alleghanies—it will have done more perhaps for its own special branch of science than any other single body of inquirers.

Mr. Clarke's report of his excavations and explorations in the Southern Trond is clear, modest, and practical (5). The site of Assos is of course one of subordinate interest and importance, and the remains, however completely investigated, can hardly be worth the very diligent and costly labour which, with all the enthusiasm of a discoverer, the reporter proposes to bestow upon them. As the foundation of an American School of Archaeology at Athens directed to the investigation of other sites of historic or prehistoric interest, as a first sample of the results to be obtained by the labour of such a school, consisting as it necessarily must of a few classical enthusiasts, supported by that liberality in point of money which is never wanting in the States, the present volume is perhaps a little disappointing. A more promising field of inquiry, or at all events one likely to yield more sensational results, might well have been chosen for the first experiments. But Mr. Clarke's work has been thorough and conscientious, and his achievements are certainly more than proportionate to the means at his disposal, if somewhat unsatisfactory in themselves.

The rest of the volumes on our list for this month are, with scarcely an exception, of minor significance. The little volume published by the Massachusetts Historical Society is one of those peculiar to American literature—a collection of literary and oratorical tributes to the memory of two of the most distinguished authors out of the long list of names whereof the Bay State may reasonably be proud (6). In losing Longfellow and Emerson, Massachusetts has lost perhaps the two of her citizens, with the exception of the present Minister to England, best known and most admired outside her own frontiers. But tributes of this kind, however appropriate at the moment, possess no permanent or general interest.

Mr. Bigelow's little monograph on the story of Molinos (7) is of much higher quality; a real contribution to historical biography, brief and modest, but adequate to its subject.

Those who have read the author's previous books will easily anticipate the quality of *Paddle and Portage* (8), a lively narrative of one of those autumn excursions in the wilder parts of the settled States of which the more adventurous class of Americans are naturally fond. The great rivers and the numerous lakes of the North-Eastern States afford no little encouragement to the lovers of the modern fashion of canoe-travelling; though the hardships to be endured, the labour sometimes involved in carrying, not merely the canoes, but the necessary supplies for weeks to be spent at a distance from all the resources of civilization, would startle those whose experience has been gathered on the tamer waters of Europe, with roads or railways always available to convey their boats and stores from one stream to another.

A Summer in the Azores (9), if less amusing and lively, is equally readable, and has a merit, rare in American books of travel, even when dealing with beaten ground—that of extreme brevity.

Mr. Greenleaf's account of ten years spent in Texas (10) belongs to a wholly different class of works, and one even more ephemeral. It gives a fair idea alike of the resources of the southernmost of the American States, and of its wild and still half uncivilized character; but it hardly, perhaps, lays due stress on the vast progress which has been made of late in the development of the one and the amendment of the other.

Mr. Dangborn's sketch of the scenery of the Baltimore and Ohio Railway (11) is something between a traveller's narrative and an ordinary illustrated guide-book.

Troublesome Children (12) is a volume that will doubtless be a favourite with those for whom it is chiefly written; it may well serve to keep them quiet during some of those hours necessarily spent in the drawing-room which are apt to be so irksome, not only to themselves, but to their elders, when provided with less attractive occupation.

(5) *Report on the Investigations at Assos, 1881.* By Joseph Thacker Clarke. Boston: Williams & Co. London: Trübner & Co. 1882.

(6) *Tributes to Longfellow and Emerson.* By the Massachusetts Historical Society. Boston: Williams & Co. London: Trübner & Co. 1882.

(7) *Molinos, the Quietist.* By John Bigelow. New York: Scribner's Sons. London: Trübner & Co. 1882.

(8) *Paddle and Portage from Moosehead Lake to the Aroostook River.* By Thomas S. Steele, Author of "Canoe and Camera," &c. Illustrated. Boston: Estes & Lauriat. London: Trübner & Co. 1882.

(9) *A Summer in the Azores; with a Glimpse of Madeira.* By C. Alice Baker. Boston: Lee & Shepard. London: Trübner & Co. 1882.

(10) *Ten Years in Texas.* By A. B. Greenleaf. Selma, Aa.: W. G. Boyd. London: Trübner & Co. 1881.

(11) *Picturesque B. and O.; Historical and Descriptive.* By J. G. Dangborn. Chicago: Knight & Leonard. London: Trübner & Co. 1882.

(12) *Troublesome Children; their Ups and Downs.* By One of Them. Illustrated. Boston: Williams & Co. London: Trübner & Co. 1882.

The Harvard Ballads (13) may, perhaps, be more appreciated by a public to which Harvard is better known than to ourselves or our readers. The best local *vers de société* of Oxford or Cambridge might lose much of their point if translated to an American soil.

Mr. Innsly's *Love Poems and Sonnets* (14) are decidedly above the level of the class to which they belong; they possess merits of thought, taste, and expression, as well as of versification, which redeem them from mediocrity, but are hardly sufficient to lift them in these days above the mass of fairly meritorious poetry doomed to almost immediate oblivion.

Mr. Ballard's solution of the Pyramid problem (15) seems to lie in a strong, if not well supported, conviction that these gigantic buildings were intended as "theodolites," or rather landmarks, for the land surveyors of the Pharaohs—the theory hardly, we think, likely to supersede that which regards them as astronomical, or rather perhaps astrological, observatories.

Mr. Boisen's (16) and Mr. Wentworth's (17, 18) school-books, and Messrs. Rossiter's and Wright's treatise on modern house-painting (19) deserve no more than a mention.

The same may perhaps be said of the four volumes forming part of the Reports of the Secretary of the Interior (20) for 1879 to 1881.

An elaborate *Report on the Culture of the Sugar Beet* (21) has, of course, no little practical value for those who are interested in a comparatively new experiment in American agriculture. It contains a mass of information upon the subject, including probably nearly all that French experience could afford, and maps and diagrams showing clearly, among other things, within what American limits the culture of the beet can be successfully attempted.

A somewhat similar interest, similarly limited, attaches to Mr. Gardiner's *Report of the New York State Survey for 1880* (22), Mr. Ingersoll's monograph on the oyster fisheries of the Union (23), and Mr. King's (24) on the statistics of the production of gold and silver in the States, which form part of the gigantic and still incomplete accounts of the Census of 1880.

(13) *Sly Ballads in Harvard China*. By E. S. M. Boston: Williams & Co. London: Trübner & Co. 1882.

(14) *Love Poems and Sonnets*. By Owen Innsly. Second Edition. Boston: Williams & Co. London: Trübner & Co. 1882.

(15) *The Solution of the Pyramid Problem; or, Pyramid Discoveries*. By Robert Ballard. New York: Wiley & Sons. 1882.

(16) *Preparatory Book of German Prose*. By Hermann B. Boisen, A.M. Boston: Ginn, Heath, & Co. 1882.

(17) *Elements of Algebra*. By G. A. Wentworth, A.M. Boston: Ginn, Heath, & Co. 1882.

(18) *A Practical Arithmetic*. By G. A. Wentworth, A.M., and Rev. T. Hill, D.D., LL.D. Boston: Ginn, Heath, & Co. 1882.

(19) *Modern House-Painting*. With Twenty Coloured Plates. By E. K. Rossiter and F. A. Wright. New York: W. T. Comstock. London: Trübner & Co. 1882.

(20) *Annual Report of the Secretary of the Interior for the year ended June 30, 1879*. 3 vols. Vol. III.—Ditto for the year ended June 30, 1880. 3 vols. Vol. I.—Ditto for the year ended June 30, 1881. 4 vols. Vols. I. and II. Washington: Government Printing Office. London: Trübner & Co.

(21) *Report on the Culture of the Sugar Beet and the Manufacture of Sugar therefrom in France and the United States*. Washington: Government Printing Office. London: Trübner & Co. 1880.

(22) *Report of the New York State Survey for the year 1880*. Albany: Ward, Parsons, & Co. 1881.

(23) *The History and Present Condition of the Fishery Industries—The Oyster Industry*. By E. Ingersoll. Washington: Government Printing Office.

(24) *Statistics of the Production of the Precious Metals in the United States*. By C. King. Washington: Government Printing Office.

NOTICE.

We beg leave to state that we decline to return rejected Communications; and to this rule we can make no exception.

THE UNITED STATES.

The Annual Subscription to the SATURDAY REVIEW, including postage to any part of the United States, is £1 10s. 4d., or \$7 58 gold, and may be forwarded direct to the Publisher, Mr. DAVID JONES, at the Office, 38 Southampton Street, Strand, or to Mr. B. F. STEVENS, American Agency, 4 Tra/alyar Square, London. International Money Orders can be sent from any office in the United States, and Subscriptions, payable in advance, may commence at any time.

PARIS.

Copies of the SATURDAY REVIEW may be obtained every Saturday of M. FOTHERINGHAM, 8 Rue Neuve des Capucines.

The publication of the SATURDAY REVIEW takes place on Saturday Mornings, in time for the early trains, and copies may be obtained in the Country, through any Newsagent, on the day of publication.

Copies of the SATURDAY REVIEW Bill of Contents will be forwarded every Friday Evening by post, prepaid, to any Newsagent in Town or Country on application to the Publisher.

THE SATURDAY REVIEW

OF
POLITICS, LITERATURE, SCIENCE, AND ART.

Price 6d.

CONTENTS OF NO. 1,409, OCTOBER 28, 1882:

Egypt. The Debates on Procedure.
Mr. Herbert Spencer on America. Professor Palmer's Expedition.
Lord Randolph Churchill's Case. Mr. Gladstone and Liberty. More Sops for Ireland.
Dynamite and the French Republic. River Communications for East London.
Free Schools and High Schools.

A French Critic on Wordsworth.
The Influence of Education on Observation. Duelling Dramas.
The Dunceth Sacrifice. The Local Government Board Report.
The Coming Fisheries Exhibition. Threatened Strike in the Coal and Iron Trades.
International Electric Exhibition at Munich. The Cambridgeshire.

Miss Mitford's Correspondents.
The Early Days of Australia. English Political Leaders—William Pitt.
Treherne's Temptation. Publications of the Early English Text Society.
Barrett's Life of Balf. Hamerton's Graphic Arts. Valentina.
American Literature.

London: Published at 38 SOUTHAMPTON STREET, STRAND, W.C.

ADVERTISEMENTS.

DORÉ'S GREAT WORKS, "CHRIST LEAVING the PRÆTORIUM," "CHRIST ENTERING JERUSALEM," and "MOSES BEFORE PHARAOH," each 33 by 22 feet; with "Dream of Pilate's Wife," "Christian Martyrs," &c. at the DORE GALLERY, 35 New Bond Street. Daily. Tenth to Six. 1s.

M E M O R I A L to Dr. P U S E Y. There will be a MEETING of CHURCHMEN on Thursday, November 16, at Three o'clock, at 29 Arlington Street, W., to consider the best form of Memorial to Dr. Pusey. The Marquis of SALISBURY, K.G., Chancellor of the University of Oxford, will preside. The Lord Bishop of Oxford, the Lord Bishop of Ely, Earl of Carnarvon, the Dean of St. Paul's, Earl Beauchamp, Canon Liddon, Right Hon. Sir J. R. Mowbray, Bart, M.P., Right Hon. A. J. Buxford Hope, M.P., Archdeacon Denison, and others, have promised to attend. Tickets of admission, and any information, may be obtained from JOHN W. BUCHANAN RIDDELL, Hon. Sec. 65 Belgrave Road, S.W.

LONDON HOSPITAL TRAINING SCHOOL for NURSES, WHITECHAPEL, E.

Increased accommodation having lately been provided, there are several vacancies for MEDICAL and SURGICAL NURSING which the 800 beds of the London Hospital present. Probationers are received on payment of One Guinea a week, for periods of Three Months. There are also several vacancies for Probationers, who, if appointed after a month's trial, will be admitted to the Hospital as Regular Nurses. The NURSING LECTURES are given every Wednesday at 8 P.M. First Course—On the General Details of Nursing, by Miss LUCKES, Matron to the Hospital, commencing in Second Course—On Elementary Anatomy and Surgical Nursing, by FREDERICK TAYLOR, Esq., F.R.C.S., Assistant-Surgeon to the Hospital, commencing November 1, 1882. Third Course—On Elementary Physiology and Medical Nursing, by A. ERNEST SANSON, Esq., M.D., F.R.C.P., Physician to the Hospital, commencing in March 1883. A limited number of Ladies admitted on payment of Half-a-Guinea for each Course. For further particulars apply to A. H. HAGGARD, Secretary.

MILITARY EDUCATION in GERMANY.—Colonel B. WILKINSON (late R.E.) and Lieutenant-Colonel W. SHAW (late Garrison Instructor, Aldershot) RECEIVE RESIDENT PUPILS for Sandhurst and Woolwich. Applications for admission to be made to the Commandant, Woolwich. During twelve months ending September 1st (not the number of Pupils taken being always limited to 60, residents and non-residents included) 33 successes were scored.

Address—Darmstadt, Germany.

HYDE PARK COLLEGE for LADIES, 115 Gloucester Terrace, Hyde Park.

The SENIOR TERM begins November 1. The JUNIOR HALF-TERM November 1. A COURSE of LECTURES on ENGLISH LITERATURE, by Professor HALES, of King's College, beginning November 6.

A BARRISTER, Classman in Two Schools (Oxford), READS in Chambers with GENTLEMEN for the Bar and Solicitors' Examinations, and for Matriculation at the Universities.—Address, M. E., Reading Room, Inner Temple.

ROME.—TWO CHARTERHOUSE MASTERS, who have spent some time in Rome, and understand its climate, &c., wish to form a party of THREE or FOUR BOYS to VISIT ROME during the Christmas Holidays.—Address, Rev. C. C. TANCOCK, or Rev. G. S. DAVIES, Charterhouse, Godalming.

THE PROPRIETOR of a High-Class BOYS' SCHOOL in the Suburbs of London requires a PARTNER, with Capital of £1,500.—Address, with full particulars as to age, experience, &c., to FRITZ, Theobald Bros. & Miall, 33 St. Swithin's Lane, E.C.

OXFORD or CAMBRIDGE.—GRADUATE in CLASSICAL HONOURS WANTED on an Annual Engagement to devote the whole day to TEACHING LATIN and GREEK. Must be about Thirty Years of age.—Apply, in the first instance by letter only, stating salary required, to X. "Verrinder's" Library, High Street, Kensington, W.

A VACANCY having occurred in the PROFESSORSHIP of GREEK and LATIN in the MASON SCIENCE COLLEGE, Birmingham, the Council are prepared to receive Applications (accompanied by Testimonials) for the appointment. The stipend is £200 per annum, plus two-thirds of the Class fees. Applications must be sent in to the Secretary (G. H. MORLEY) not later than the 31st Inst. Further particulars may be obtained from the SECRETARY.

THE COUNCIL of the GIRLS' PUBLIC DAY SCHOOL COMPANY, Limited, will shortly appoint HEAD-MISTRESSES for HIGH SCHOOLS to be established in BROMLEY (Kent) and TUNBRIDGE WELLS. Salary in each case £250 per annum, besides Capitation fees. Applications must be sent, not later than November 11 next, to the SECRETARY of the Company, 21 Queen Anne's Gate, S.W., from whom further information may be had.

WRITINGS COPIED at 2d. per Hundred Words. Special Estimates for large quantities of Copying.—KERR & LANHAM, 3 Chichester Rents, by 84 Chancery Lane, London, W.C.

UNIVERSITY and PUBLIC SCHOOLS CLUB.—GENTLEMEN making application for Election to this Club should STATE THE NAME of their UNIVERSITY or SCHOOL, and date when there.—Address to the SECRETARY, 5 Park Place, St. James's Street, S.W.

THE LONDON RIVERSIDE FISH MARKET COMPANY.

Incorporated by special Act of Parliament of the present Session, whereby the liability of Shareholders is limited to the amount of their Subscription.

CAPITAL £255,000, in 25,500 Shares of £10 each.

£1 to be paid on application; £2 on allotment; £2 not less than three months after allotment, and subsequent calls not to exceed £2 each.

Directors.

JAMES ALFRED HALLETT, Esq., 7 St. Martin's Place, Charing Cross. Major JOSHUA GRANT CROSSE, late 88th Regiment, Guildford. ALFRED FROST, Esq., Messrs. Frost Brothers, London Street, E.C., and Shadwell. Captain THOMAS EDWARD SYMONDS, B.N., 10 Adam Street, Adelphi. ROBERT HEWETT, Esq., Roden Lodge, Barking, Essex, *Managing Director*.

Bankers.

Messrs. BARNETTS, HOABES, HANBURY & LLOYD, 62 Lombard Street, E.C.

Architect and Surveyor.

CHARLES DUNCH, Esq., St. Clement's House, E.C.

Solicitors.

Messrs. DOLLMAN & PRITCHARD, 45 Cornhill, E.C.

Auditor.

W. H. HARDY, Esq., Chartered Accountant, 5 Great Winchester Street, Old Broad Street, E.C.

Brokers.

Messrs. GUY & HEWETT, 3 Adam's Court, Old Broad Street, E.C.

Secretary.

D. W. WISE, Esq.

OFFICES—43 TRINITY SQUARE, TOWER HILL, E.C.

PROSPECTUS.

This Company is incorporated by the London Riverside Fish Market Act, 1882, and its object is to establish a wholesale, semi-wholesale, and retail market for the sale of fish, on the north side of the River Thames, at Shadwell, just below and adjoining the principal entrance to the London Docks.

The inadequacy of the fish supply of the Metropolis, so long and so loudly complained of, can only be remedied by obtaining better market accommodation than is afforded by Billingsgate, within its limited area, and its crowded approaches. Any such improvement there is practically impossible; but without the authority of Parliament no other fish market could be established.

Under these circumstances, application was made to Parliament for powers to construct and build the market now proposed to be made, and, after an exhaustive inquiry in both Houses, lasting twelve days, such powers were granted to this Company.

In 1880, Mr. SPENCER WALPOLE, then one of Her Majesty's Inspectors of Fisheries, made a report to the House of Commons on the construction of a fish Billingsgate; in consequence of the alleged inadequate accommodation at that market; and in this report he went at length into the question of the Fish Supply of the Metropolis, the requisites for a good market, and as to what, in his opinion, ought to be done to improve the supply.

In 1881, the Corporation of London appointed a Committee to inquire into the unsatisfactory state of the fish supply of the Metropolis, and to report the best mode of increasing the quantity and quality of the supply.

The Company's market will comply with the recommendations of Mr. WALPOLE and of the Fish Supply Committee, who, after examining a great number of witnesses (including catchers and senders of fish, carriers by land and water, and other persons interested in the trade) advised that such market should be "at the waterside, with ample and sufficient approaches, and should be a wholesale, semi-wholesale, and retail market, all under one roof, open at all seasons, and with a large area of land and water, and with full accommodation for buyers and sellers, and standing room for vans while being unpacked."

Mr. WALPOLE inspected the site of the proposed market at Shadwell, and gave evidence in support of the Bill in both Houses of Parliament, and stated that in his opinion it fulfilled all the conditions he had laid down as requisite for a good market.

The site occupies nearly 8 acres, having a waterside frontage of 600 feet, and is situate in a bend of the river, out of the ordinary traffic, and below the difficult navigation of the Upper Pool, the site being well adapted for the arrival of fish at the wharf-gate.

The site is four railway stations within a short distance of the market. It will be in communication with the Commercial and other roads, and so with the main arteries of the river, by numerous good roads and streets comparatively free from traffic. Several ferries, and the East London Railway, by its line through the Thames Tunnel, will afford direct access to the southern side of the river. The position of the market and its approaches appear on the plan which accompanied the Parliamentary Petition.

The depots of those railways which bring the principal portions of fish from the Coast to London, are the Great Eastern, at Bishopsgate, and the Great Northern and Midland at Royal Mint Street. From both these points the roads are wide and of easy gradients, and the vans from those depots with the land-borne fish will be able to come alongside the market-place on three sides to unload. With regard to water-borne fish, the facilities afforded are unparallelled, as the river will be dredged so that will be able to come alongside the Company's wharf and discharge directly into the market.

Arrangements have been made with the owners of three of the largest fleets of vessels fishing in the North Sea to bring their catches to the market; and the evidence before the Parliamentary Committees shows that, with enlarged accommodation, such as will be provided by the Company's market, there will be a great increase in the supply of prime fish, while the quantity of inferior fish, such as fish, herrings, sprats, mackerel, and the cheaper kinds of fish, will be enormously augmented.

Owners of fishing vessels at Hull, Grimsby, Yarmouth, Brixham, Ramsgate, Dover, and other fishing ports will be able to bring their own fish to market and sell it themselves, instead of being obliged to send it to agents, as they are now compelled to do, through the practical impossibility of getting accommodation in Billingsgate, and the fishermen and the public will thus be brought into direct communication with each other, to the obvious advantage of the public.

The quality of water-borne fish is well-known to be superior to that brought by land carriage, and will always draw the bulk of the customers, and this, with the advantage of easy access, will make the market most attractive for all kinds of fish.

The market-place will occupy a space of 75,000 superficial feet, or nearly two acres, and will be surrounded on the three land sides by wide approaches and lay-bys occupying over two acres together on the Company's own land and quite out of the traffic of the public streets, so as to afford space for the standing of the thousands of vans, carts, and barrows belonging to the customers.

The market-place will be capable of providing at least 270 stalls for the sale of fish, leaving ample space for the free circulation of customers and porters, and will be open at all hours of the day from 5 A.M.

The remaining four acres of the site will be available for the erection of wharves, offices, shops, and other depots, curing-houses, and other buildings and premises, the rents of which, with the market tolls and stallings, will, it is estimated, be sufficient to pay good substantial dividends after deducting all expenses and outgoings.

Of the capital, £100,000 will be subscribed by the Directors and their friends. The Company will have the advantage of the great business experience of Mr. HEWETT, who will act as Managing Director.

Mr. HEWETT, one of the Directors of the Company, in December 1881 entered into a contract with the Trustees of the Will of the late Lady Gianni, who own a large estate at Shadwell, for the purchase of the greater part of the freehold (subject to existing leases and tenancies) of the land on which the market will be built. It was then that he should at his own risk use his best endeavours to obtain the passing of the Company's Act. The late Mr. HEWETT has achieved, notwithstanding the opposition of the Corporation of London. It has been arranged that Mr. HEWETT shall sell the land agreed to be purchased by him of the Trustees of the Company's Act to be determined by arbitration in the manner provided by the Land Clauses Consolidation Act, 1846, and that the sum so paid over the contract price agreed to be paid by Mr. HEWETT to the Trustees shall belong to him, and be his sole remuneration for the trouble and risk he incurred in obtaining the Company's Act.

No promotion-money will be paid to anyone.

A print of the Company's Act can be seen at the Offices of the Company and of their Solicitors.

Should no allotment be made the deposit will be returned in full.

Prospectuses and Forms of Application can be obtained at the Offices of the Company, and of the Bankers, Brokers, and Solicitors.

HOTELS.

BRIGHTON.—BEDFORD HOTEL.—Facing Sea and Esplanade. Near the West Pier. Central and quiet. Long established. Suites of Rooms. Spacious Coffee-room for Ladies and Gentlemen. Sea-Water Service in the Hotel. BENJN. BULL, Manager.

ILFRACOMBE.—THE ILFRACOMBE HOTEL.—facing the Atlantic. Grounds, 5 acres. Tennis Lawn, 250 Rooms. Table d'hôte at separate tables from 6 to 8 P.M. Large Swimming Bath. Hot, Cold, and Tepid Sea, and Fresh Water private Baths, Douche, Shower, &c.—Address, the MANAGER.

TOTLAND BAY, Isle of Wight, near Alum Bay.—TOTLAND BAY HOTEL.—Magnificent sea views. Comfort with moderate charges. Billiard-room and tennis lawn. Bracing Air. Excellent sands and promenades pier. Best bathing in the Island. Good anchorage for yachts. During Winter Season, very moderate Boarding Terms.—Apply to the MANAGER.

THE ANTI-STYLOGRAPH (HEARSON'S PATENT).—Carries a good supply of ink and a pen with ordinary nibs, made of non-corrodible metal. Is a Pen and Inkstand in one.

THE ANTI-STYLOGRAPH (HEARSON'S PATENT).—Prices, fitted with non-corrodible pens: Pocket Size, 2s. 6d.; Desk Size, 3s. 6d. Pens for refilling the Anti-Stylograph, 1s. per box. May also be had, fitted with Gold Pen, Iridium-point, 10s. 6d.

THE ANTI-STYLOGRAPH (HEARSON'S PATENT).—Is not a stylograph or point-writer, but a true pen, and preserves all the usual characteristics of the handwriting; it may therefore be used for shorthand and for signatures.

THE ANTI-STYLOGRAPH (HEARSON'S PATENT).—Any ink may be used, the pen being made of a non-corrodible metal. Is easily refilled, and contains sufficient ink to last several days.

THE ANTI-STYLOGRAPH (HEARSON'S PATENT).—Is a pen which requires no dipping, and is ready for instant use without adjustment. May be carried in the pocket with perfect safety.

THE ANTI-STYLOGRAPH (HEARSON'S PATENT).—Is a reservoir holder, carrying a non-corrodible pen with ordinary nibs, renewable at pleasure, and is an article of the utmost utility to all. Of all Stationers. Wholesale only of the Manufacturers, THOS. DE LA RUE & CO., London.

APOLLINARIS

“THE QUEEN OF TABLE WATERS.”

“Earl SPENCER, K.G., Pres. International Medical Exhibition, August 1881, referred to Apollinaris as a typical beverage, approved by the faculty.”—*Sanitary Record*, March 1882.

JENNER & KNEWSTUB are now offering, at Half-price for Cash, the whole of their SURPLUS STOCK of Useful Elegancies, suitable as Presents; also the whole of a Manufacturer's Stock of First-class Leather Goods, which they have just purchased, and are enabled, owing to the prolonged depression of trade, to offer at half the usual cost.

JENNER & KNEWSTUB, to the Queen, 33 St. James's Street, and 66 Jermyn Street, London.

DECORATIVE ART GALLERIES, 103 NEW BOND STREET.—Permanent Exhibition. Complete House Decoration and Furnishing, with the best guarantees of good taste and economy. Estimates free. Selected Objects, English, Continental, and Oriental, suitable for Home Embellishment and Art Presents. Pictures.

FURNISH YOUR HOUSE OF APARTMENTS THROUGHOUT on MOEDER'S HIRE SYSTEM. The original, best, and most liberal. Cash Prices; no Extra Charge for time given. Large, useful Stock to select from. Illustrated price Catalogue, with Terms, post free.—318, 319, and 320 Tottenham Court Road, and 19, 20, and Morewell Street, W. Established 1883.

**JAPANESE
LEATHER
PAPERS.**

FOR DADOS, WALLS, AND SCREENS.
From 1s. per piece.

WALL PAPERS AND CURTAIN STUFFS.
Artistic and Inexpensive.

C. HINDLEY & SONS,
290 to 294 OXFORD STREET, W.

HUNYADI JÁNOS.

“The Best Natural Aperient Water.”

LONDON MEDICAL RECORD.

“Certain and painless, soft and mild.”

Professor V. GARTNER, Stuttgart.

“Most pleasant to the palate.”

Professor V. NUSSBAUM, Munich.

The name of the “APOLLINARIS COMPANY, LIMITED,” on the Label secures genuineness.

Of all Chemists and Mineral Water Dealers, at 1s. 6d. & 2s. per bottle.

GOLD MEDAL, PARIS. MEDALS—SYDNEY, MELBOURNE, CHRISTCHURCH, N.Z.

FRY'S COCOA EXTRACT

IN PACKETS AND TINS.

GUARANTEED PERFECTLY PURE COCOA ONLY.

“If properly prepared, there is no nicer or more wholesome preparation of Cocoa.” Dr. HASSALL.

“Strictly pure; well-manufactured in every way.” W. W. STODDART, F.I.C., F.C.S., City Analyst, Bristol.

Try also FRY'S CARACAS COCOA.—“A delicious preparation.”

SIXTEEN PRIZE MEDALS awarded to J. S. FRY & SONS.